

Duquesne University

## Duquesne Scholarship Collection

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

---

Fall 12-16-2022

# INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATION AS A DISCOURSE: A PROBLEM WITH INTEGRATION

Rana Ramadan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

---

### Recommended Citation

Ramadan, R. (2022). INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATION AS A DISCOURSE: A PROBLEM WITH INTEGRATION (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/2070>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection.

INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATION AS A DISCOURSE:  
A PROBLEM WITH INTEGRATION

A Dissertation

Submitted to the McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for  
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Rana Ahmad Ramadan

December 2022

Copyright by  
Rana Ahmad Ramadan

2022

INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATION AS A DISCOURSE:  
A PROBLEM WITH INTEGRATION

By

Rana Ahmad Ramadan

Approved September 28, 2022

---

Erik Garrett, PhD  
Associate Professor of Communication  
& Rhetorical Studies  
(Committee Chair)

---

Janie Harden Fritz, PhD  
Professor of Communication &  
Rhetorical Studies  
(Committee Member)

---

Inci Ozum Sayrak, PhD  
Associate Professor of Communication  
& Rhetorical Studies  
(Committee Member)

---

Kristine Blair, PhD  
Dean, McNulty College and Graduate  
School of Liberal Arts  
Professor of Philosophy

---

Janie Harden Fritz, PhD  
Chair, Department of Communication &  
Rhetorical Studies  
Professor of Communication  
& Rhetorical Studies

## ABSTRACT

### INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATION AS A DISCOURSE: A PROBLEM WITH INTEGRATION

By

Rana Ahmad Ramadan

December 2022

Dissertation supervised by Erik Garrett, PhD

*Integrated Marketing Communication as a Discourse: A Problem with Integration* examines *integration* within Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) scholarship in light of Jürgen Habermas's discourse ethics and related communication ethics literature. Integration is a notion with dual meanings: one is technical, and the other philosophical. Technical integration is a perception management strategy that has been received as the competitive advantage for marketing communication for decades. Habermas's philosophical/social integration is a communicative act that transmits culturally stored knowledge. It contextualizes norms in an appropriate theoretical framework, and it controls behaviors and personality structures. At the heart of IMC theory is an ambition to reach global audiences for maximum financial returns. This is especially true for already globally recognized and successful brands.

However, the ethical struggle appears in the consequences of commodification of humanity. Racialism, offensive language, culturally irrelevant advertising, or violent mediated content saturate integrated communication. They resemble a form of integrated “Orientalism” inspired by Edward Said’s critique of colonial textual misrepresentation of the distant Orient. These ethical issues appear more neglected within the framework of IMC education. Habermas’s philosophical discussions grounded in the interplay of public sphere theory, the notion of communicative rationality, and democratic cosmopolitanism fill gaps related to the ethical void in technical integration. The interplay of the three Habermasian notions helps to question the legitimacy and ability of integration in crafting culturally-biased identification of “universal truth.” It also fulfills the identification of discourse in general. Envisioning IMC discourse as a living understanding of universal-humanistic critical communication ethics points to implications important to the commercial and academic worlds. Discursive treatment of IMC explores the potentials of public participation as they appear in the pedagogical experience carried by IMC teachers and students, IMC academic programs, and universities. This dissertation aims to structure a critical constructive pedagogy for IMC that helps to generalize integration as an ethical communicative phenomenon.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I still remember that morning in later October of 2021, around 4:45 a.m. My mother, husband, three-year old daughter, and I ran through the corridors of King Abdulaziz Airport to catch the 5 a.m. flight from Jeddah to Washington DC. At that moment, I felt the blessings of an unconditional love and support. For my family, travelling with me to the United States so that I could finish my degree was non-negotiable. They all wanted to be there for me. In the city, there was my father, who I left at home praying for my return as a doctor in advertising, my sister, and my two brothers. My family's faith in my dream has kept me moving forward despite all the challenges on the road. Thank you all.

Dr. Erik Garrett, my dissertation director, has shown support toward every idea I brainstormed throughout this project. Thank you.

I also acknowledge Drs. Ronald C. Arnett, Pat Arneson, Janie Harden Fritz, Craig Maier, and the rest of the Department of Communication & Rhetorical Studies family at Duquesne University. Their teaching and guidance have offered me not only an education but also a life experience. Thank you all.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract .....	iv
Acknowledgement .....	vi
Table of Contents .....	vii
<b>Chapter 1: Project Plan .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Statement of Problem .....	5
1.2. Significance of Problem .....	8
1.3. Methodology .....	10
<b>Chapter 2: IMC Discourse and Integration: An Overview .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1. IMC Emergence, Theories, and History .....	16
2.1.1. Definitional Issues .....	18
2.1.2. Branding, Measurement, Media, and Global IMC .....	22
2.1.3. Culture .....	28
2.1.4. Teaching IMC .....	31
2.2. Integration .....	34
2.2.1. Schultz’s Route to Integration .....	34
2.2.2. Toward a Humanistic Integration .....	44
2.3. Conclusion .....	47
<b>Chapter 3: Habermas and the Ethics of Discourse .....</b>	<b>49</b>
3.1. Critical Philosophy of Communication Ethics .....	51
3.2. Habermas’s Critical Communication Ethics .....	60
3.2.1. Public Sphere Theory .....	64
3.2.2. Communicative Rationality .....	68
3.3. Habermas, Foucault, and Cosmopolitanism Theory .....	76
3.4. Conclusion .....	80
<b>Chapter 4: Rethinking Integration .....</b>	<b>83</b>
4.1. Integrated Orientalization .....	86
4.1.1. The Text .....	90
4.1.2. The “As a Discourse” Methodology .....	93
4.1.3. An Invitation to Deliberate Boundarylessness .....	100
4.2. Rethinking Integration .....	107
4.3. Conclusion .....	116



<b>Chapter 5: Critical Constructive Pedagogy for IMC .....</b>	<b>120</b>
5.1. Why and How IMC is an Activity-Based Theory .....	123
5.1.1. Awards Set the Standards .....	130
5.2. Transversal Rationality .....	133
5.3. Critical Constructive Pedagogy for IMC .....	137
5.4. Conclusion .....	146
<b>Chapter 6: Conclusion .....</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Works Cited .....</b>	<b>161</b>

## Chapter 1

### Project Plan

*Integrated Marketing Communication as a Discourse: A Problem with Integration* is an inquiry inspired by contemporary global branding practices. For example, consider the recent activities of Formula One (F1), a giant media and entertainment brand that has promoted racing sports since the 1950s. In December 2021, F1 held its first racing rally in Saudi Arabia. That Saudi Arabian Grand Prix is considered one of many F1 racing events across the Middle East and North Africa region (MENA) that implement the company's global expansion strategies. International media covers all aspects of the event such as the actual racing news and competition, comparisons to previous F1 events, and the global market's reaction toward being in Saudi, a country that has been mysterious to Western media for decades. The event was an opportunity for many to visit the country for the first time, like the British champion Lewis Hamilton.

Hamilton's publicity proved to go beyond racing technicalities. He said, "Our sport must do more to force change," referring to global suspicion about human rights in Saudi Arabia ("Hamilton" *Times*). Hamilton expressed that Saudi Arabia is in need of modern changes, such as in its understanding of human rights. Major news companies like CNN, ESPN, and the Daily Mail reported that Hamilton was uncomfortable visiting and racing in Saudi Arabia. He called for national changes in Saudi laws regarding same-sex relations, political activism, and alignment with international human rights in general. He wore his rainbow-colored helmet as a symbol of his support for LGBT rights during the racing finale.

F1's integrated public relations, especially those voiced by Hamilton, followed a similar tone during the March 2022 Saudi Arabian Grand Prix. F1 went back to Saudi Arabia for a two-

year contract. This time, Hamilton carried his concerns regarding the Saudi laws on the death penalty in addition to the previous issues. The night prior to the grand opening of the race, a Houthi missile attacked the Saudi Aramco oil facility that is less than twenty miles away from the racing location. In response to concerns about this political disturbance, the F1 event went on as scheduled.

It is important to mention that the F1 event in Saudi Arabia was executed in accordance with the brand's traditions and global standards for entertainment, logistics, crowd management, urban planning, target-audience inclusivity, fine dining, visual branding, outdoor music, celebrating the championship, etc. These guidelines permitted pouring alcoholic beverages on stage. As such, this event sounds like a disturbance of the public climate of Saudi Arabia, a country that has maintained religious conservatism since the late 1970s. Yet, due to serious political changes in the country, lifestyle changes have occurred, involving gender segregation, music in public, and unveiled women in advertising. These changes have brought the Saudi market closer to the international standards for entertainment. Despite the global Covid-19 pandemic and the Houthi terrorist attack, the F1's annual report published remarkable financial outcomes for 2021–2022 compared to previous years (*Libertymedia.Com, 2022*).

In 2017, F1 went through several strategic rebranding campaigns led by Wieden and Kennedy London (“Formula 1”). In collaboration with MTV and *Bloomberg Businessweek*, F1 and W+K engaged in creating a new visual identity that included logo, brand behaviors, and typography. Since then, the integrative efforts have been aiming to position F1 as a “forward-facing entertainment brand, which works across a multitude of channels” promoting “speed, attack, and control” (“Formula 1”). The launch of the new brand identity was covered in more than a thousand global media channels, including BBC, Fast Company, the Telegraph, Complex,

ESPN, High Snobiety, Daily Mail, and It's Nice That. Part of the rebranding strategy has been dedicating organized efforts to support international causes for human rights such as the protection of children from labor and the protection of same-sex relationships. The brand's goal has been to challenge domestic laws that contradict "internationally recognized human rights" ("Statement of Commitment"). Ellie Norman, the Director of Marketing at F1, said,

I wanted W+K to unlock the universal truth for a global audience that would allow us to build F1 into a global media and entertainment business, with the soul of a race car driver...I particularly like that they'll take inspiration from outside the industry and cultural trends into everything they do. ("Formula 1")

Norman's statement departs from the presupposition that "universal truth" is identifiable for an audience that is as wide as the global marketplace. Based on his assumptions, his marketing vision aims for an international expansion represented by the reality of F1 race drivers rooted in a Western individualistic philosophy and the capitalistic commodification of humanity. A statement like Norman's is important to consider in exploring the humanistic integration envisioned by communication ethics of difference and diversity and by the study of IMC ethics. Such an exploration develops through unpacking Jürgen Habermas's discourse ethics, Edward Said's cultural criticism and humanistic boundarylessness, and Calvin O. Schrag's transversal rationality in the pedagogical context. These three major discussions aim to suggest a humanistic integration at the core of critical constructive pedagogy for IMC in which cultural particularities, the primacy of the human consumer, and integrated communication strategies are maintained.

This dissertation aims to explore the humanistic dimension of the notion of integration within IMC. Integration is the perception and consensus management strategy and the marketing communication competitive advantage that touches internal and external organizational aspects

(Schultz et al., *Integrated Marketing Communications*). However, doing integration on a global scale faces an intellectual dilemma rooted in the Western individualistic philosophy and the capitalistic commodification of humanity. Within both dimensions, the meaning of universal morality is blurred. Brands and advertising managers struggle to find an ethical application of the meaning of universal morality that keeps in mind local ethical codes and cultural particularities. While looking for universal truth within local cultural boundaries, brands struggle to find a minimal ethical balance. Just by stepping into the commercial world, corporate bodies live the paradox of aiming for a “better” state of humanity while reserving their financial assets.

Between the theoretical aspiration of seeking a marketing communication integration (F1 marketing strategy on paper) and the actual application of that integration (Hamilton’s version of universal truth), the ethics of IMC lacks important focus on cultural particularity with respect to difference and diversity. The F1 case highlights a contradiction in the notion of integration that struggles between theorizing about the primacy of the human being (Kliatchko) and talking about, promoting, and legalizing culturally irrelevant concepts while doing global branding. The higher awareness of activating corporate social responsibility trends and the pressure of acting humanely in the marketplace contribute to this contradiction. More human rights organizations and consumer advocacy groups have been raising public awareness about the inhuman capitalistic practices such as neglecting the rights of vulnerable or minority social groups (Kliatchko). As a result, global brands face the challenge of choosing and supporting universally humanistic causes while maintaining relevancy to minority and cultural boundaries. F1 commercial branding is one of many illustrations of the market struggle that occurs when trying to implement integrated communication on a global and multi-cultural scale.

The F1 event highlights a theoretical problem within IMC literature involving a gap in exploring ethical dimensions. The focus on definitional issues in IMC literature, the fragmentary nature of conceptualizing IMC, and the struggle between technical and philosophical integration has been blurring crucial issues. This dissertation aims to explore the following questions: How does IMC literature, specifically Schultz et al.'s route to integration as perception and consensus management, crystalize the problem of loss of humanistic ethical integration? How do critical communication ethics through Habermas's discourse ethics contribute to the loss of ethical integration? To what extent is rethinking integration as a humanistic form of boundarylessness achievable via Said's *Orientalism*? How is such an ethical approach to integration actualized through Calvin O. Schrag's transversal rationality in the educational context? Is a critical constructive pedagogy applicable in IMC education today?

### **1.1. Statement of Problem**

In *Integrated Marketing Communications: Putting It Together and Making It Work* (1993), Schultz et al. conceptualize integration as a perception management strategy and marketing communication response to the nature of processing information in the global marketplace after the ramifications of World War II. The "system of information storage" that consumers relied on shifted from valuing facts to gathering scattered pieces of information to guide purchasing and consumption decisions (Schultz et al.). The ramifications of media technology and fragmentation urged public audiences to value perceptions over facts to guide consumption decisions. The systematic labor of legitimizing unified and packaged public consensus becomes a corporate matter and mission (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*). Integration becomes focused on the technicality of unifying the details that structure brand images and of monitoring the reception of those images on the public.

The theoretical efforts of Schultz and his colleagues can be explored to address the ethical void in IMC studies. Discussions of the consequences of capitalistic commodification of humanity, racialism, offensive language, culturally irrelevant advertising, and promoting violence have been neglected when developing IMC literature (Kliatchko) or even advertising discourse (Fu). However, building from the technicality of integration as perception and consensus management brings IMC studies closer to questioning the legitimacy, rationality, and morality of the notion of integration while crafting global identification of universal truth.

*Integrated Marketing Communication as a Discourse: A Problem with Integration* examines *integration* within IMC scholarship in light of Habermas's critical communication ethics. The pillars of Habermas's discourse ethics come from conceptualizing the public sphere, communicative rationality, and democratic cosmopolitanism. Public sphere theory emerges in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1991), which is important to both critical philosophy of communication (Arnett and Holba) and the communication ethics of diversity and difference (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*). Then, in *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason* (1987), Habermas argues that moral claims can validate any type of discourse, all extracted from the system of "social integration." Social/ philosophical integration is a communicative act that transmits circulated knowledge and cultures, and it normalizes social contexts into their appropriate theoretical frameworks. Social integration also regulates collective behaviors and personality structures. Democratic cosmopolitanism, or cosmopolitanism theory in a Habermasian sense is an extension of the Kantian critique of reason. Through this theory, Habermas engages with Michel Foucault's perspective on power and the production of knowledge. By aligning the three notions of the public sphere, communicative rationality, and

cosmopolitanism, Habermas's critical communication ethics establishes coordinates that are important to IMC practitioners and teachers implementing integration as an ethical communicative phenomenon.

Elaboration on the Habermas-Foucault debate on the notion of discourse is important to this dissertation. The Foucauldian discursive formation is important to discussions on power and representation of power in the marketplace. When Said uses this analysis to examine *Orientalism* as a discourse, he unpacks the potentials and attributes of discourse in shaping the textual power that controlled Western-Oriental relations for centuries. He examines the Orient/Occident relations since the colonization moves of the eighteenth century and how they "hooked" the MENA region to Western capitalism since then. It is an interaction that shapes how global brands do contemporary mediated, cross-cultural communication and representation of Otherness (*Orientalism*). Said's Foucauldian-based criticism traces the imbalance between power and knowledge within the discursive and the visual representation of Otherness. His critical approach is helpful for analyzing widely circulated corporate stories. Habermas and Foucault both present a critique of power but from different perspectives, and such an evaluation of power and its representational forms is important for reconsidering the validity and morality of integration as known in IMC studies. Accordingly, this dissertation aims to answer the following question:

RQ1: To what extent is integration understood as an ethical communicative phenomenon an achievable praxis that can help global branding practices and IMC education?

To answer this question, each chapter of this dissertation will focus on the following questions: How does IMC literature, specifically Schultz et al.'s route to integration as perception and consensus management, crystalize the problem of loss of humanistic ethical integration? How does critical communication ethics through Habermas's discourse ethics



contribute to the loss of ethical integration? To what extent is rethinking integration as a humanistic form of boundarylessness achievable via Said's *Orientalism*? How does Said's Foucauldian cultural criticism highlight the deficiencies of the Habermasian position on criticism and discourse? And how can that cultural criticism help rethinking integration? In the last chapter, this project aims to structure a critical constructive pedagogy for IMC. The communicative praxis helps to reach a living understanding of Calvin O. Schrag's transversal rationality in the university context. Between transversal rationality and the idea of the university as a community, Schrag strengthens a critical constructive pedagogy for IMC.

## **1.2. Significance of Problem**

Neglecting integration theories is problematic on two levels. First, integration within IMC literature emerges from the conceptual discussions already characterized by fragmentation. Such a conceptual fragmentation prevents IMC ethics from moving forward (Kliatchko). Lack of focus on integration points to how IMC suffers the paradox between theoretical and practical implementation of the field's principles. In theory, integration is a humanistic, consumer-based, and unifying corporate voice. However, when it comes to practice, global brands' humanistic assertions contradict with local norms. With the F1 example in the background, claiming that a multi-national brand departs from an already known meaning of universal truth is a problematic presupposition. While IMC scholars aim for a humanistic and philosophically justified discipline, global brands morally struggle when it comes to meeting, knowing, or representing diversity, difference, or Otherness in advertising, public relations, or associated mediated content. The humanistic assertions preserve a "moral muteness" about the rationality of generalizing a biased representation of universal truth and humanity that exclusively attune to Western individualistic values (Kliatchko). Instead, the relationship between the East and West is

controlled by what Said (*Orientalism*) conceptualizes as the “textual attitude” that legitimizes a specific representation and perception of Otherness based on the power of discourse. This cross cultural representation is aided by ideologies and advertising all rooted in eighteenth-century colonialism without an examination of their rationality (Fu). It also reflects the commodification of humanity that is embedded and sealed in the modern market as a form of colonization (Habermas, *Volume 1*). Neglecting the means of integration prevents IMC ethics from examining embedded diversity within universal truth. Habermas and the universal-humanitarian communication ethics offer elaborations on this point.

The second problematic level of neglecting integration appears when aiming to develop the IMC educational brand (Kerr; Kerr and Kelly). In academia, the IMC educational brand battles many problems, such as the questions of which IMC program and school of thought curricula should use, which skills are the most important for IMC students to acquire from an academic degree in IMC, and which principles should be maintained when transferring IMC education from one cultural setting to another, like from the United States to the MENA region. These questions and more neglect the importance of the idea of the university in shaping students’ ability and preparedness to accept difference and diversity. In *The Resources of Rationality: A Response to the Postmodern Challenge*, Calvin O. Schrag’s notion of “transversal rationality” offers a balance between particularity and universality, and when it is applied to the idea of the university, a critical constructive pedagogy for IMC emerges. Transversal rationality helps actualize the communal balance between particular interests and universal rights. It comes as a contribution that lies at the center of a critical constructive praxis of IMC.

Habermas’s critical communication ethics, Said’s cultural criticism represented by humanistic and deliberate boundarylessness, and Schrag’s transversal rationality carry IMC

praxis in a balance between criticism and constructive creativity. The three theories create a balance between universal morality and situated cultural criticism so as to find a place for integration as an ethical communicative phenomenon. Throughout his works, Said maintains the distinction between “the will to understand for purposes of co-existence and humanistic enlargement of horizons” and the “will to dominate for the purposes of control and external dominion” (*Orientalism* xiv). Such an understanding aims to find a place within Habermas’s universal morality and how he perceives “social integration” (Habermas, *Volume 2*). Habermas, Said, and Schrag offer a situated reflection about the Other that is responsible but not necessarily reciprocal.

The implications of this theoretical reading have the potential to guide marketing communication pedagogy in utilizing constructive criticism within their academic programs. Between the validity and the impossibility of humanistic ethical integration, implications of the study can assist local and international marketing communication agency, brand managers, content creators, and IMC education and students. Generalized information from this study can be used to ask questions about the moral framework of mass media practices and the ways in which they are extended to education and vice versa. Such a theoretical net helps IMC ethics increase sensitivity to racial and cultural differences. A critical constructive approach to IMC is important for students, future practitioners, and teachers in the field.

### **1.3. Methodology**

The method of inquiry is interpretive, grounded in philosophy of communication ethics. Hannah Karolak states, “Philosophy of communication ethics examines the interplay between philosophies of communication and communication ethics to reshape, reengage, and restructure our approach to the study of communication ethics” (316). Philosophy of communication is a

qualitative method of inquiry that unpacks philosophical means to assist communication studies. It utilizes multiple philosophical traditions, including hermeneutics, phenomenology, epistemology, rhetorical theory, moral philosophy, and critical theory (Arnett and Holba). Here, Habermas's critical philosophy of communication ethics is important because it centralizes communicative rationality within argumentation and reasoning. He utilizes socio-philosophical justifications to guide rational argumentative speech that lies at the center of discourse ethics (Habermas, *Between Facts*). He shows how "discourse principles," which are moral, ethical, or pragmatic argumentative norms, can elevate mere "procedurally regulated bargaining" (100). Habermas's theory of communicative action elevates a moral discourse depending on the norms of argumentation and communicative competence. It operates in a lifeworld where bias and ideology are colonized by media-steered systems and commodity fetishism (Habermas, *Volume 1*). Universal morality becomes visible through the interplay of discourse principles and moral principles.

Understanding integrated marketing communication (IMC) as a discourse is akin to the different understandings of discourse within the works of Habermas and Foucault. It is a discussion that allows introducing Said's contribution to understanding discourse as a colonial form of power and domination (*Orientalism*). A discourse, for Foucault, is a tool to produce knowledge (Radford). However, Habermas's understanding of discourse points to guidance of the rationality of the communicative pursuit (Habermas, *Volume 2*). From these discussions on discourse, Said adds a situated reflection that is central to Otherness and cultural differences. His examination of *Orientalism* "as a discourse" narrows the universal discussion proposed by Habermas about discourse ethics. Said examines the textual power that controlled the Occident and the Other's interactions for centuries, hoping to replace that imposition with humanistic and

deliberate “boundarylessness.” This form of boundarylessness prioritizes the entity of the Other without prior judgment or prejudice. The cultural criticism Said provides when combined with the discursive methodology learned from Habermas presents a case of a living understanding of humanistic communication ethics. It is an understanding that connects power and representation of power to philosophy of communication ethics and applied communication studies.

The next four chapters will lead to the capability of philosophy of communication ethics to produce a critical constructive pedagogy for IMC. Chapter 2 is a literature review of IMC that prioritizes the notion of humanistic integration. Understanding integration alongside the sister fields of public relations, corporate communication, and organizational communication is important here. Chapter 3 presents Habermas’s critical communication ethics as the methodology to explore the means of integration and discourse. Chapter 4 focuses on rethinking a humanistic approach to integration and the applicability of such an approach on a multicultural scale. Understanding IMC as a culturally biased theory is important for this discussion. Said’s understanding of discourse as a representation of power illustrates such a Western bias reflected in the colonization acts during and after the eighteenth century. It is an analysis that points to the individualistic system of interaction that forms and characterizes Western philosophy and culture. Chapter 5 aims to present a rational ethical approach to integration embedded within a critical constructive pedagogy for IMC. The rational is based on a praxis that aligns IMC’s educational brand, Schrag’s transversal rationality, and the Western idea of the university. From such a metaphorical and theoretical net appears an IMC praxis that balances criticism and constructive creativity. IMC praxis acknowledges the communal and ethical principles of learning in a university along with an attentiveness to marketplace promotional practices.

## Chapter 2

### IMC Discourse and Integration: An Overview

*Integrated Marketing Communication as a Discourse: A Problem with Integration* examines the notion of integration within IMC scholarship to establish coordinates for practitioners and teachers in the field to discuss and implement integration as an ethical communicative phenomenon. IMC scholar Don Schultz conceptualizes integration as a perception and consensus management strategy that resonates with the contemporary human consumer's nature and needs while creating value-based marketing communication programs. However, such an understanding of integration has not been widely circulated to support disciplinary development. Major IMC studies, especially quantitative, still view integration as tactical message management that is separate from corporate and organizational cultures. Such an imbalance in perceiving the core and identity of integration prevents the IMC discipline from moving forward based on solid conceptual and philosophical structures. It increases the conceptual fragmentation that characterizes IMC in the first place and blurs crucial discussions in the literature related to ethics and culture. The loss of focus between issues of definition, branding, measurement, media, global IMC, culture, and education within IMC makes it challenging to explore the moral dimensions of doing integration, especially in the global branding.

A relatively young discipline that officially emerged in the late 1980s, IMC brings business and management communication theories from other older disciplines into conversation with each other, pulling from marketing, public relations, advertising, corporate communication, and organizational communication (Kerr; Kitchen and Schultz, *Raising the Corporate Umbrella*). Some of these disciplines, such as advertising and public relations, have been

included within IMC studies as promotional mix tools. Here, integration as perception management strategy becomes the competitive conceptualization for which IMC should strive after decades of fragmentation. Overcoming the conceptual clutter around IMC and integration creates an entrance to expand the ethical background to integration both theoretically and in global practice. Understanding the dimensions of integration on perception and consensus management highlights the missing connections between IMC understood as a culturally biased theory, practiced ethically, and taught as such. This chapter views IMC literature as a discourse containing integration as a humanistic postmodern notion. Such a holistic discursive perspective highlights its importance to the creation of culturally relevant integration and pedagogically effective IMC with the following questions in mind: where is integration in current IMC literature, and what is the status of humanistic integration in the literature? By answering these questions, this chapter aims to build the first layer in exploring integration as an ethical and communicative phenomenon.

IMC discourse emerged as a marketing vision that legitimizes organizational control of all communicative functions (Christensen et al., “Integrated”). It is part of the rhetoric of reality shaping the twenty-first-century marketing paradigm and marketing communication (Kitchen, *The Future*). Within IMC discourse, integration emerged as a professional response to the “system of information storage” that consumers relied on to make purchasing decisions (Schultz, “The Inevitability”; Schultz et al., *Integrated*). Instead of valuing facts, consumers relied on gathering scattered pieces of information, awakening communicative fragmentation changing the global market according to Western marketplace standards (Schultz, “Redesigning Marketing”). In theory, it took more time to recognize the weight of IMC as a “one voice” discourse valuable to corporate communication. Early studies in the literature split between approaching IMC as a

mere tactical integration of promotional and mediated messages (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*), assuming that integration is strategically “nothing new” (Eagle et al., “Perceptions”), and as an “imperialist” move that spreads unified Western values through market activities (Rose and Miller, “Integrated”). Even IMC pedagogy has neglected to consider moral dimensions around managing public consensus as an important topic to future practitioners (Kerr; Kerr and Kelly). Issues around conceptualizing and structuring theoretical and philosophical elements of IMC become lost to the effect of media fragmentation and “digital disruption” on IMC education (Kerr and Kelly). More conceptual divisions appear when IMC aligns itself to the maturity and historical weight of corporate communication studies and raises the “corporate umbrella” (Kitchen and Schultz, *Raising the Corporate Umbrella*). A notion like “integrated communication” earns the fame, becoming a form of legitimizing corporate communication activity (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*) and an official representation of what IMC is (Schultz et al., *Integrated*; Schultz et al., *The New Marketing Paradigm*; Schultz, “The Inevitability”). Between conceptualizing IMC as “nothing new,” as an imperialist move, and as a corporate umbrella, the popular image of IMC discourse is puzzled and scattered.

This chapter presents a comprehensive literature review of the IMC field and the notion of integration within. In the edited book *The Evolution of Integrated Marketing Communications: The Customer-driven Marketplace* (2011), Schultz et al. present a content-based framework that summarizes the most important topics covered in IMC literature. In addition to covering issues of definition, branding, measurement, media, and global IMC, Schultz and his colleagues give a specific focus on culture that explores the effect of Western biases on developing the theory. From this cultural focus comes the entrance to the communication ethics of IMC in which culturally relevant practices are preserved or neglected



while doing global branding and integration (Kliatchko). Accordingly, the chapter explores a deeper understanding of Schultz's route to integration, and his meaning of integration is compared to others that emerge in corporate communication, organizational communication, and early public relations and advertising histories. Integration understood as perception and consensus management offers both, a theoretical weight and deficiencies, hoping that a holistic discursive interpretation can highlight its theoretical essence. This chapter concludes with a humanistic vision of IMC that centralizes ethical integration attentive to postmodern market language.

### **2.1. IMC Emergence, Theories, and History**

Tracking the development and emergence of different IMC theories shows how fragmentation characterizes the field. IMC emerged from practice, and practice has been highly connected to wider factors like branding, media technology, and globalization (Schultz and Schultz). Even considering the field as emerging during the 1990s is recent (Rose and Miller, "Merging"; Schultz et al., *Integrated*). Within that history, various opposing directions emerge to defend IMC as an organizational route to integration, a message approach to integration, or a tool-based approach to integration (Tafesse and Kitchen). Other scholars focus on the autonomy of integration and its position within marketing communication (Duncan and Everett). The projects of scholars like Philip Kitchen and Don Schultz are two of the most popular and widely circulated efforts to overcome the field's fragmentation. Kitchen is an important scholar and professor of marketing with research interests in marketing theory, IMC, branding, and global marketing. Kitchen worked at different schools in Ontario, Canada, United Kingdom (UK), and France. He also directed the Research Centre for Marketing, Communications, and International

Strategy. He is the founder and editor of the *Journal of Marketing Communications*, published for the first time in 1995.

In one of the most widely cited articles, Kitchen et al. (“The Emergence”) from the University of Hull in the UK present a historical overview of the emergence and developmental process of IMC. They analyze different conceptual stages of the field for the purpose of placing IMC within marketing and communication studies. The “separatist manner” of discussing IMC tools such as advertising, sales promotion, public relations, and direct marketing in theory and practice has not been helping the field to develop. It points to a continuous semantic fragmentation that unfolds two problems: First, the inconsistent research development in the archeology of the field is lost between tactical and strategic organizational levels (Torp). Second, the early unsolved scholarly problems inherited from marketing relations studies struggle to identify marketing communication as a “sell/buy” transactional relationship or as a “two-way” interactional communication (Duncan and Moriarty). Such fundamental and unsolved problems highlight the nature of conceptual fragmentation characterizing IMC theories.

Don Schultz et al. (*The Evolution*) suggest a content-based framework for dealing with the “uneven development” in IMC theories, tackling problems of definition, branding, measurement, media, marketing theory, emerging markets, culture, and education within IMC. There has been slow progress in understanding IMC beyond the tactical coordination of promotional mix tools, especially within quantitative studies (Šerić). Basically, “the issues of developing integrated marketing communication programs simply are not the same” (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*), which reflects on theorizing the field and vice versa. The content-based approach allows a comprehensive review that uncovers different quantitative and qualitative methodologies important to postmodern integrated communication (Kitchen and Uzunoglu). It

moves IMC to “mid-range level of maturity” based on a systematic disciplinary intersection with other business and marketing management concepts (Kerr and Patti). Jerry Kliatchko has a similar framework that explores popular research topics in IMC from 1990 to 2006. Some areas of focus appear in common with Schultz et al. (*The Evolution*), including issues of definition, cross-cultural practices of IMC, branding, media, and measurement. Kliatchko summarizes that the most important discussions surround definitional issues, practice and branding, global IMC, measurement, and media. Concepts deserving less attention include internal organizational and managerial issues related to IMC application. The following sub-sections will cover in depth definitional issues, branding, measurement, media, global IMC, culture, and IMC education.

### **2.1.1. Definitional Issues**

Recognizing the complexity of defining IMC appears on a wide scale in the literature. Definitional issues in IMC attract the most scholarly attention, and from there emerges secondary discussions on the importance of integration and integrated approaches (the focus of this dissertation). The complexity of reaching a conceptual consensus on an IMC definition that appeals to both theory and practice is controlled by the marketplace and the communication system operating within (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). The fragmentation of digital communication contributes to this complexity in which consumers’ connectivity and the voluntarily information they generate can compete with the information produced by large corporations (Kitchen, *The Future*). Definitions of IMC, or the lack thereof, affect the implementation of IMC in the postmodern and global world (Kitchen and Tourky; Kitchen and Uzunoglu). It also contributes to liberating IMC from abstraction to a “strategic integration” (Kerr and Patti). Defining IMC responds to the perception that the field is “simple rhetoric” that

cannot develop beyond being a management style (Cornelissen and Lock), and it validates the discursive strategic concept that constantly needs development (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*).

Starting with the most recent studies, Kliatchko conceptualizes IMC in a manner that highlights the field's historical conceptual transformation. He presents a summary of the three major conceptual frameworks grounding IMC stemming from Kitchen and Schultz, Duncan and Moriarty, and Nowak and Phelps (Kliatchko). All three frameworks emerged in 1989 as proposals for the first formal definition of IMC, sponsored by Northwestern University and the American Association of Advertising Agencies (the 4As). Based on a survey of advertising practitioners, the framework of Schultz and Kitchen concluded that IMC is

a concept of marketing communications planning that recognizes the added value of a comprehensive plan that evaluates the strategic roles of a variety of communication disciplines—general advertising, direct response, sales promotion, and public relations—and combines these disciplines to provide clarity, consistency, and maximum communication impact. (Schultz et al., *Integrated*)

This definition has been widely circulated within books (Baldinger; Kitchen and De Pelsmacker; Kliatchko; Lloyd; Petrison and Wang; Thorson and Moore) and journal articles (Duncan and Caywood; Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”; Percy). However, it has been critiqued as a definition that promotes a “weak” conceptual core that does not offer enough justification for differentiating between IMC as a “one voice,” inside-out approach and a strategic holistic and corporate wide perspective (Duncan and Everett; Kitchen and De Pelsmacker; Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”). Kliatchko adds that this first definition lacks any reference to the importance of consumers, the public, and the measurement of promotional acts.

From there, Schultz defines IMC as “the process of managing all sources of information about a product/service to which a customer or prospect is exposed which behaviorally moves the consumer toward a sale and maintains customer loyalty” (Kliatchko 11). Schultz shows early signs of understanding IMC as a consumer-based integration process that focuses on the human consumer prospect (Duncan and Caywood). Yet, his definition still lacks discussion of measurability and strategic thinking (Kliatchko). More discussion of marketing relations between organizations and customers appears in the definition of IMC as the “process of strategically controlling or influencing all messages and encouraging purposeful dialogue to create and nourish profitable relationships with customers and other stakeholders” (Duncan and Caywood). The last framework of Nowak and Phelps does not present a straightforward statement but offers some elaborations on previous efforts (Kliatchko).

All three frameworks view IMC as a process that coordinates different communicative acts based on the power of aligning audience behaviors on one corporate line. A common point between Schultz and Duncan is that they view IMC as a kind of connectivity between all stakeholders and consumers for the purpose of extending reciprocal market relationships. Yet, Schultz’s direction is the only one that extends IMC towards branding and brand management (Kliatchko). It connects to Philip Kotler’s definition of IMC as “the concept under which a company carefully integrates and coordinates its many communications channels to deliver a clear, consistent and compelling message about the organization and its products” (Percy). Schultz’s definition also explains the potential of digital power in the public’s hand (Kitchen). Instant communication and social media increased the access of “ordinary people” to create, share, and acquire products, services, information, and knowledge (Troup). The whole marketing

experience becomes an important aspect of corporate branding that values the “system of people,” their behaviors, lifestyles, and their wants and needs (Kliatchko; Schultz and Schultz).

Metaphors like “consistency” and “control” become important for establishing a conceptual base for IMC that can overcome its fragmentary nature. The market awareness of a synergy between different persuasive voices in the 80s and 90s further developed toward theoretical achievement by the 2000s (Thorson and Moore). The persuasive aspect within IMC started to prioritize how different media channels support each other, how other-than-advertising promotional tools (such as personal selling) can guide a marketing campaign, and how different stakeholders (like internal employers and suppliers) are important assets. Schultz and colleagues have been feeding this direction, which invests in advertising, public relations, sales promotions, and “other communication activities” that could include internal organizational communication and globally external corporate communication (Schultz et al., *Integrated*; Schultz and Schultz). The notions of consistency and control elevate the “not yet” integrated marketing paradigm of the 1980s toward a marketing promise that communicates humanely (Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”). From the corporate need to establish a unified branding voice, IMC as a controlling phenomenon has been gaining strength in the early literature.

In the 2000s and beyond, IMC has been studied in an inclusive manner that keeps in mind factors characterizing the twenty-first-century global marketplace, such as media, the technological revolution, and consumer engagement. As such, IMC has become a holistic discourse (Gould) that has a valid theoretical weight (Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”), an educational brand and academic future (Kerr; Kerr and Kelly), and a relation to the whole language of marketing development (Cornelissen). In the last two decades, IMC has become a globally recognized academic field beyond its popularity in the US, Europe, and the UK. For

example, more studies are published from the Philippines (Kliatchko), the Asia-Pacific region (Kliatchko and Schultz), and Russia (Levina). It has been recognized even more in practice to measure its impact on brand image in Saudi Arabia (Ahmad) and the Gulf Cooperation Council Countries (Kamali-Chirani).

### **2.1.2. Branding, Measurement, Media, and Global IMC**

The interrelated topics of branding, measurement of returns on investments, media, and global IMC contribute to the systemization of IMC literature. In the contemporary postmodern and globalized market, measuring the returns on investments through tracking media performance within branding activities is the new title that functions to protect corporate and organizational communication (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*; Skinner). On the other hand, corporate communication becomes responsible for a wide array of marketing communication functions under the name of branding, including sales, advertising, image and reputation, media relations, crisis and issue management, and technical communication (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*). As a result, a “synergy” between the persuasive voices produced by those scattered outlets becomes a necessity (Thorson and Moore). It is a holistic branding effort rooted in managerial and organizational studies that inspired many to follow. Ots and Nyilasy call it the “practice turn” in IMC that utilizes non-normative and inspires bottom-up integrated practices. The practice turn to branding in general and to IMC in particular becomes a key element and one of the drivers behind the growth of IMC literature.

Branding originates from David Aaker’s theories. What Schultz’s school adds to Aaker is humanistic and behavioral dimensions to branding that grow on brand awareness, quality, loyalty, and symbolic association. For instance, brand awareness is a communicative act and a response to modern marketing controlled by mass communication, mass production, and mass

consumption (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). Awareness manages how stakeholders perceive a brand (Aaker) while branding in general attends to the complexity of doing business within advertising agencies (Eagle et al., “Insights”; Eagle et al., “Perceptions”; Swain). The complexity of branding comes from dealing with tangible variables to gain consumer awareness and market position through a “co-creative approach” to branding that asserts social context (Ots and Nyilasy). Branding here offers solutions to overcome market problems by bringing theory and practice into conversation (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*). Branding becomes the synonym for integrated communication that aligns decades of theoretical progress in marketing and related fields with what the contemporary marketplace requires. From there appears the different dimensions of discrepancies between theories and what IMC practitioners perform in the marketplace (Cornelissen; Cornelissen and Lock; Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”).

When it comes to measuring returns on investments, IMC has been highly affected by the communicative revolution (Peltier et al.). Research measuring the performance of IMC programs and the fascination with data tracking and virtual promotional tools neglects the constant state of conceptual defense with which IMC has been engaging since the late 80s (Tafesse and Kitchen). The phrase that describes the collective consumption behaviors of advertising, public relations, and sales is “loss of synesthesia” (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). In this context, Schultz and colleagues refer to the integration of consuming media messages and the challenging environment to measure the public effect of such messages. Integrated consumption, or what Pilotta and Schultz call “simultaneous media usage,” undermines traditional media measurement. As a result, synesthesia as the integrator of mixed sensory experience requires special attention



during early media planning and allocation to challenge new and emerging media consumption behaviors.

Big data invites more consumers into dialogic relationships with their favorite brands through various channels all at once in a multi-dimensional interaction. Accordingly, measuring consumers' reactions while they consume advertisements does not reflect their overall interest in a brand's performance. Such a blurred synergy between brands' performance and measuring returns on investments contradicts how Schultz and Schultz give measurement a primary position within IMC communicative programs along with planning, implementation, and evaluation. As a result, integration has lost its important role as an interactive communication tracker.

In addition to branding and measurement, discussions on media are important enrichments to IMC literature. The notion of fragmentation appears again and characterizes the discussions of media and IMC (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). The ability to generate information through mediated platforms comes with extra features such as the ability to duplicate, share, alter, or regenerate messages (Kerr and Kelly). Historically, media buying was affected by marketing massification between the 50s and 80s, when direct consumption was the primary outlet of social production (Ogilvy). The "massification of industry" started earlier in 1910 with Henry Ford's invitation to institutionalized mass production (Ewen 25). Maximizing production power not only increased the quantity of goods produced in a short time but also transformed the whole ideology of the American national market. Corporations across the country focused on designing marketing experiences around consumption power. Advertising agencies were pioneers in adopting an integrative approach to combine below- and above-the-line media strategies and tools to drive mass consumption and media hegemony (Schultz and Schultz). Everyone working in advertising and media planning saw the potential for their labor to expand

to a global market. Television advertising created the amusement that children and adults needed during that time of economic transformation (Postman). The mediated revolution became hard to manage and track.

Globalization is one of the key drivers behind the emergence of IMC (Schultz and Schultz). The global integrated marketing communication (GIMC) framework aims to maintain a holistic and transnational management style (Gould). IMC emerged in a “sophisticated Western marketing system” that faces challenges when trying to implement unified integrated campaigns across different nations (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). The problem happens when the promotional mix intersects with corporate culture situated within national and local culture. Such a cultural system can be maintained or neglected (Gould). GIMC faces managerial issues that complicate the implementation of unified, cross-cultural strategies while maintaining cultural relevancy to the human consumer. It is a problem that multinational advertising agencies (Gould; Gould et al.; Grein and Gould; Ogilvy) and public relations studies have been struggling with for a long time (Rebel).

The intersection of branding, measurement, media, and GIMC becomes more crystalized when situating marketing communication within corporate communication instead of being solely a promotional mix. In *Raising the Corporate Umbrella*, Kitchen and Schultz conceptualize a paradigm shift in IMC that focuses on integrated communication and feeds the corporeal body while aligning marketing and non-marketing activities. This view suggests that

integrated communication acts like the ribs of an umbrella in that the various communication activities of the firm support the overall communication system. Lose or mismanage one of the communication “ribs” such as crisis management or corporate

advertising and the whole communication coverage of the organization becomes unstable and exposed to the stormy winds of change. (6)

The umbrella metaphor indicates the emerging needs of CEOs and senior managers in the twenty-first-century globalized marketplace. The intersection of IMC and corporate communication is directed by a corporate-wide harmony between advertising and marketing departments, sales people, direct marketing activities, point-of-purchase, Internet marketing, product packaging, and after-purchase customer service (Kitchen and Uzunoglu). Organizations thus become spaces of actualizing strategic business plans, independent brands for profit-making, and publicly recognized entities in the eyes of various internal and external stakeholders.

By raising IMC literature to a corporate-wide level of discussion, Kitchen and Schultz allow the disciplinary strength of corporate communication studies to feed and support IMC. Christensen et al. define corporate communication as “a management function that offers a framework and vocabulary for the effective coordination of all means of communications with overall purpose of establishing and maintaining favorable reputations with stakeholder groups upon which the organization is dependent” (*Corporate Communications* 2). Corporate communication studies emerged in the mid-nineteenth century from the “story of an ongoing legitimation crisis” as a response to increasing public scrutiny of social and moral corporate actions (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*). The field takes its inspiration from the Latin “corpus” meaning “body”; to “incorporate” is to integrate, while “corporation” indicates a group of people acting as one body (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*). Here, IMC becomes integrated communication that creates the corporeal body and cares for marketing and non-marketing details. The range of “functions” that corporate communication should manage

includes marketing communication activities, sales, advertising, image and reputation, media relations, crisis and issue management, and technical communication (Christensen et al., “Title”).

Take the role of “simultaneous media experience and synesthesia” as an example (Pilotta and Schultz). Different types of media technologies like radio, newspapers, and films have the ability to stimulate perceptual content through audio-visual elements, storytelling, touch, or all of these at once. Pilotta and Schultz state, “It is our body positionality, our imagination, memories—indeed our horizons—that offer perceptual content. With *radio* our perceptual presence thickens; we hear one’s laughter and—synesthetically—hear her smile and her expressive face” (19). Such an integration of different corporate communication and IMC functions increases the role of transforming reality. Instead of perceiving media content as mere representations of space, time, and distance, mediated and corporate experiences deliver taken-for-granted “*presences without distances*” (Pilotta and Schultz 19). As a result, corporations gain a legitimate role in shaping reality, despite the increasing challenges of measuring media effects or calculating resonance to consumers.

The common concern between IMC and corporate communication becomes managing how the public receives and views the corporate body, especially with media disruption (Kitchen and Schultz, *Raising the Corporate Umbrella*). Market fragmentation makes managing the quantity of symbols and public messages a challenging task. The ability to generate information through mediated platforms comes with extra features like the ability to duplicate, share, alter, or regenerate messages (Kerr and Kelly). Metaphors like “integrated communication” and “legitimacy,” examined by corporate communication scholars, attach IMC and corporate communication to the rhetorical “corpus” as the holistic and encompassing body (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Van Riel and Fombrun).

Branding has become an umbrella practice for managing entire corporate entities, including their products and services, while corporate communication has become a “mindset,” especially with the rise of media technology (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications 2*). Notions like corporate branding (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*), brand story (Heugens), and corporate reputation (Valcke and Lenaerts; Walker) appear equally important to IMC studies and practices (Kitchen and Uzunoglu; Kerr and Patti). The interplay of the three notions with the presence of rapidly developing new and instant media become fundamental in maintaining stable brand equity and developing culturally relevant practices. Ultimately, it appears impossible to separate the discussions on branding and brand awareness from measurement, media, and global IMC. The intersection between these concepts points to the nature of doing effective integrated communication in the contemporary marketplace.

### **2.1.3. Culture**

Schultz et al. present a specific focus on culture alongside issues of definition, branding, media, measurement, and GIMC. They emphasize that “the IMC concept is culturally biased” (*The Evolution 9*). The notion of culture refers to the biased origins of the IMC theory sensitive to the Western market and educational needs. Such a cultural bias poses questions about the validity of IMC theory and practices outside the Western reality and whether integrated communication is valid to apply at the same speed across different cultural contexts. Current treatment of the notion of culture by IMC scholars realizes that applying the theory should be attentive to cultural and national differences (Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”). Systematic digital disruption in the communication system must also focus on culture (Cornelissen; Firat et al.; Groom, “Integrated”; Kitchen and Uzunoglu; Kliatchko; Schultz et al., *The Evolution*).

However, dimensions of cultural differences are still lacking attention in the literature. IMC literature has made brief contributions to the challenges facing advertising practitioners outside their local agencies (Gould), to the role of culture within IMC ethics (Kliatchko), and to the role of culture for the IMC educational brand (Kerr). IMC scholars invest more in the applied notion of culture, which connects the literature to organizational culture, corporate culture, and postmodern IMC (Christensen et al., “Integrated”).

Studies in culture and IMC touch the critique of modernity both directly and indirectly and the role of postmodern theories within that. Retailing, distribution, and the role of technology and the communication revolution have all redefined modern market power, causing the whole marketing reality to change accordingly (Kitchen, *The Future*). Firat and Venkatesh discuss how the nature of production-consumption in the modern philosophy affects market elements, products, consumers, and media. They utilize Jürgen Habermas’s critique of modernity to find a place for consumer primacy within consumerism. Here, fragmentation shows how “market elements are separate and unique from products that are separate from customers who are also separate from media” (Schultz et al., *The Evolution* 9).

The reality of the market has always been a reference to cultural, economic, and social transitions. Stuart Ewen’s *Captains of Consciousness* (2001) presents a history of advertising that illustrates the power of mass production and how mass production has reflected the cultural consciousness that characterized American culture in the early 1900s. Women’s labor outside the house, the legitimacy of branding in geographical expression, and their effects on consumption and social change assisted the massification of promotional messages. Notions like “public communicative labor” and “emotional labor” shaped the Western culture of the market in which a refined version of modern life was extracted from stories of resistance, counter-ideologies, and

“system of belief” (Ewen 4). Between the 1950s and 80s, marketing massification characterized advertising agencies and media buying. This strengthened consumption trends, which became the primary outlet of social production (Ogilvy). Advertising agencies were the pioneers in adopting a tactical integrative approach to combine below- and above-the-line media strategies and tools to drive mass consumption and media hegemony (Schultz and Schultz). The potentials of reaching the global market were driven by the capacity of advertising and marketing activities. Televisions “were turning citizens into consumers, living rooms into salesrooms, and advertising into the prevailing vernacular of public address” (Ewen 1). Later, mass media challenged the rigidity of mass marketing more toward customer-based, database-driven, instant, and interactive methodologies (Schultz and Schultz). By the 1990s, the notion of postmodern marketing (Christensen et al., “Integrated”) appears to justify the primacy of the human consumer (Kliatchko) missing from early studies on IMC and culture.

The gap in studying the role of culture in the development and implementation of the field outside the Western academy and market affects global advertising agencies’ practices when it comes to creating culturally relevant campaigns (Gould; Ogilvy). GIMC struggles to maintain intercultural and transnational management styles and to find a balance between promotional messages and corporate culture. When the “vertical” line underpinning the promotional mix intersects with the “horizontal” line of corporate culture, national culture becomes one of many variables that can be maintained or neglected (Gould). Something like irrelevant advertising, offensive messages, or misrepresentative images of the Other appear from the shortage of extracting and understanding local meanings (Kliatchko). IMC in general and integration in particular face a managerial issue that complicates the implementation of unified intercultural strategies that maintain cultural relevancy for the human consumer. Elements of

advertising, whether legal, representational, or related to actual content, may be obliged to watch for cultural relevancy while talking to local publics (Kitchen and De Pelsmacker).

Culture as a managerial add-on to IMC connects the literature to corporate communication and organizational communication. Here, the notion of culture promises a marketplace experience that activates corporate branding based on a deeper level of understanding consumer profiles rather than just escalating market competition (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Van Riel and Fombrun). Enriching the cultural background within the IMC experience depends on a collection of aligned symbols, images, and fictional and non-fictional narratives extracted from living realities (Torp). This organizational, symbolic performance touching cultures and subcultures unpacks a deeper level of identifying the IMC theory itself.

#### **2.1.4. Teaching IMC**

IMC education is the last discussion within the content-based framework that points to lack of discussions on integration (Kliatchko; Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). Since the Medill School of Commerce at Northwestern University launched the first graduate program in IMC in the early 1990s (Schultz et al., *Integrated*), the discipline has become a popular area of study across the US, UK, EU, Philippines, and MENA region. Between 2000 and 2015, the quantity of empirical studies concerning IMC education increased by 17.5 % (Šerić). However, “academic leadership” as the consistency between the conceptual development of the discipline, marketplace needs, and teaching IMC to future practitioners is still missing (Kerr and Kelly “IMC Education”). Early IMC education studies discuss practical issues like organizational structure, leadership, and turf wars (Caywood and Ewing; Carroll; Rose and Miller, “Integrated Communications”; “Merging Advertising”). Other studies emerged from hopes in mass



communication curriculum to investigate notions like “persuasion” or “integration” learning from public relations and advertising education (Kerr). However, those efforts did not erase the fragmentation in the academic community between advertising, public relations, and mass communication studies and their split responses to the new IMC program. One group challenged the idea of calling for integration in the first place, claiming that marketing communication has been there for decades (Rose and Miller, “Integrated Communications”; “Merging Advertising”). Others found it difficult to classify integration neither as a strategic (branding) or as a tactical (promotional) function, which is also a skill that needs preparations in classrooms (Stuhlfaut and Farrell). Factors like the communicative revolution shaping the century or the academic culture of specialization have also been keeping IMC education from advancing (Kerr).

In a milestone study, Gayle Kerr, Professor of Advertising, Marketing, and Public Relations at Queensland University of Technology, Australia, brings a new perspective to challenge the fragmentation characterizing the IMC educational mix. Kerr utilizes expert observations about IMC using the Delphi method to explore “the place of IMC in the university environment,” curricular specifications, teaching, learning, research issues, challenges facing future IMC education, and the global status of IMC education (Kerr et al.). The Delphi method contributes to exploring situated probabilities by shaping collective judgements and tracking trends happening in marketing, sales, or advertising (Kerr and Patti). Kerr’s goal is to address two issues: “how advertising and public relations curricula must change (or not)” and “where IMC courses should be located—in business or in communication faculties” (page number). Kerr departs from the existing body of IMC education presented in internationally taught courses, their reach (Kerr et al.), how the educational environment encourages integration, and the impact of scattered quantitative investigations on IMC education (Roznowski et al.). She concludes that

IMC lacks a pedagogical structure, which has been neglected while developing the discipline, causing “no consensus” within IMC education (Stuhlfaut and Farrell).

Kerr and Kelly follow the implementations of Kerr and examine the role of digital disruption on IMC education. They start from the assumption that IMC practice and education work in parallel, and both are highly affected by digital disruption. The digital revolution has transformed IMC education in the university, in branding, and in curricula, and it affects the role of education on practice. Keeping in mind the global challenges of doing research and data analysis, IMC lacks interpretive and critical aspects that respond to realistic practical complexities. The fascination with big data, data tracking, and virtual promotional tools neglected the constant state of defense that IMC has been engaging with since the late 80s (Griffin and Pasadeos; Tafesse and Kitchen). IMC education resists external discussions from organizational studies about the importance of message formation to integration and the role of systematic integration to corporate branding. The IMC educational brand is not keeping up with the conceptual divide in the autonomy of integration (Duncan and Everett) nor with the culture of specialization in the Western educational system (Kerr; Wightman).

In a counter positive effort, teaching, studying, and practicing the integration of all marketing communication components has surpassed the sole emphasis on practicing classic public relations or advertising. Take the dedication of the *Journal of Integrated Marketing Communication* as an example. The journal is a publication of Medill School that covers the dimensions of reality and the truth of integration within marketing communication practices and related theories. It covers marketing and business-related problems that intertwine with big data, branding, and global fragmentation. The journal’s major focus since its first issue in 2015 highlights the centrality of the human consumer to the marketing experience. The emergence,

history, and different theories of IMC all highlight a general theme of neglecting the centrality of the notion of integration to conceptual issues, to branding, media, measurement, GIMC, culture, and IMC education. Exploring integration in depth within other disciplines like marketing, public relations, and organizational communication can drive the critical stance that IMC needs to further strengthen its theoretical weight (Kitchen et al.; Schultz et al., *Integrated*; Schultz, “The Inevitability”; Schultz and Schultz).

## **2.2. Integration**

### **2.2.1. Schultz’s Route to Integration**

This section focuses on the notion of integration presented by its advocates, like Philip J. Kitchen and Don E. Schultz, compared to the conception of integration in marketing, public relations, and organizational communication. It carries the conclusion of the chapter toward framing integration as a humanistic postmodern language important to IMC practice and education.

Don E. Schultz (1934–2020) was Professor Emeritus of Marketing Communication Studies at Medill School of Journalism, Media, and Integrated Marketing Communication at Northwestern University, who contributed great scholarly efforts to shape and expand IMC studies and theories. “In Memory of Don E. Schultz,” Philip Kitchen states that Schultz’s contributions to IMC “evolve from a good idea, to a workable concept, to a theoretical presence, and into a global study area” (page number). Since 1977, Schultz published hundreds of journal articles, more than forty books, and was a dedicated member of the American Academy of Advertising (AAA) contributing to IMC discipline and practice. In 1991, he was part of the collaboration between Medill School and AAA in launching the first empirical study that was published in *IMC: Putting It Together and Making It Work* (Schultz et al., *Integrated*). Since

then, IMC has been studied as far more than a managerial strategy, as it was originally conceived from the practical needs of advertising agencies in the 60s and 70s. Instead, IMC has responded to the factors characterizing the twenty-first-century global marketplace, such as the use of media, the technological revolution, and consumer engagement within that. Gradually, more studies started to realize the value of investing in IMC, its significance as a holistic discourse (Gould), its valid theoretical weight (Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”), its educational brand and academic future (Kerr; Kerr and Kelly), and its relation to the whole language of marketing development (Cornelissen).

Schultz, Tannenbaum, and Lauterborn (1993) define “integration” as a perception management strategy and an additive value to different marketing communication components like advertising or public relations. Perception management, here, responds to the “system of information storage” that consumers rely on. Processing information shifted from valuing facts toward gathering scattered pieces of information to guide purchase decisions (Schultz et al., *Integrated Marketing*). Schultz enlarges the IMC theoretical base by investing in the notion of integration, its theoretical intersection with corporate communication studies (Kitchen and Schultz, *Raising the Corporate Umbrella*), advertising principles, and Aaker’s branding theory (Schultz et al., *Essentials*), and with Philip Kotler’s marketing principles (Schultz and Schultz). Schultz’s conception of integration as a true paradigm has become widely circulated (Cornelissen; Duncan and Moriarty; Gould; Kitchen and De Pelsmacker; Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”; Kliatchko; Schultz et al., *The Evolution*; Tafesse and Kitchen; Thorson and Moore). It has been recognized as equally important in interactive communication and big data management studies (Peltier et al.), in marketing communication education (Griffin and

Pasadeos; Kerr; Kerr and Kelly), in global IMC studies (Eagle et al., “Insights”; Zvobgo and Melewar), and in public relations literature (Gonring).

Integration aims for communication consistency. In an “integrative review” of IMC study, Tafesse and Kitchen engage disciplinary gaps by focusing on the position of integration within definitional issues. They examine the three dominant frameworks of Kitchen and Schultz, Duncan and Moriarty, and Nowak and Phelps (Kliatchko) explained in Section 2.1.1. Despite the fragmentary nature of alienating major conceptual ideas between the three frameworks, they all agree that integration is about “communication consistency” (Tafesse and Kitchen). From this recognition, conceptualizing IMC seems lacking an important resonance to Schultz’s understanding of integration as a truth (“The Inevitability”) conceptualization of integration at tactical and strategic levels.

Tactical integration is responsible for designing, situating, and delivering messages to the public. The strategic level deals with managerial and corporate-wide integration touching employers and external stakeholders, like media agencies, government organizations, and the public. Tactically and strategically consistent integration is actualized by aligning consistent tone, characters, visual representation, and other executional components before reaching the public (Petrisson and Wang). Tactical message integration appears more popular among marketers and advertising agencies. The less understood construct is strategic integration. It took integration some time from the late 1990s to popularize the sort of connection between tactical coordination and the strategic corporate-wide integration (Kliatchko).

A study by Johansen and Andersen shows how integration became the “organising ideal” of marketing and communication activities. Integration more strongly appeared as an embodiment of corporate ideals and implementation (Kitchen and Schultz, *Raising*). Integration

in corporate communication became “the practice of aligning symbols, messages, procedures and behaviors in order for an organization to communicate with clarity, consistency and continuity within and across formal organizational boundaries” (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications* 36). Integration becomes the adaptation of the part to the whole and the toleration of differences utilizing symbolic interplay of fiction and nonfiction (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Van Riel and Fombrun). It is the process of attaching a unique voice and tone to a specific public image. Integration within corporate communication becomes “the promise...to coordinate all communication activities in order to secure consistency, clarity, continuity and, thus, maximum legitimacy, meaning, and impact inside and outside the organization” (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications* 118). It is an organized labor that balances the assurance of legitimacy with the prevention of hypocrisy, promoting clarity, simplicity, and uniqueness.

Take, as an example, the early signs of advertising as the power to manage public consensus by depicting social reality. From the historiography of advertising and the “review of business thinking,” Ewen (2001) highlights the influence of mass production on advertising and how the “prevailing vernacular of public address” eventually created and introduced consumers from a home environment. In the early twentieth century, “visual culture” dominated the social and economic scene and constructed new types of consumptions and desires (Ewen). Advertising was a communicative force that “iterated commentary on issues of want and desire, a novel philosophical system, a pivotal medium by which a new, consumerist way of life was shaped, depicted, communicated, and sold” (Ewen 8). The social condition, or socialism, was and has been the leading engine behind the social reconstruction and the changes appearing on mass media and advertising. Advertising is a “business response” and a guiding tool for exploring the

shift of capitalism from being production-based to consumption-based (Ewen 8). Perception management, here, emerges from a faith in the marketplace's resources elevated from being strategic branding approach of isolated products toward corporate branding.

Schultz's approach to integration beyond its technical meaning places higher attention on the human consumer (Kliatchko). Such an understanding of integration has roots in earlier means of integration in the twentieth century, like in organizational communication (Follett) public relations (Bernays) and marketing studies (Kitchen, *The Future; The Rhetoric*).

Mary Parker Follett was among other "pioneers" like Henry Fayol, Frederick Taylor, and Chester Barnard who contributed to the emergence and development of organizational communication studies in the 1940s (Pietri). Her understanding of integration implies an inside-out approach that starts from individual employers and moves toward public stakeholders. Prior to World War II, little systematic attention was devoted to communication problems in organizations. Communication was taken for granted and subordinated to other aspects of management. Scholars were engaged in the horizon of "mental revolution," like F. W. Taylor in the *Principles of Scientific Management* published in 1911. Such an idea influenced discussions of human well-being within effective business management studies believing in the communal role of professional human interactions (Follett).

Integration in the early 1900s aimed to overcome the deficiencies of collective responsibility through tactical or interdepartmental strategies. Here, implementing one-voice business management strategies sustained organizational communication. A notion like "integrative unity" would start from integrating internal resources like human and departmental relations as well as service coordination, all before thinking of external marketplace expansion (Follett 71). It represents the authority of each department in the organization to achieve the most

effective results from the workers within that unit (81). The scientific root of integrative unity comes from Kempf's contemporary psychology of conflict and competing desires all applied to business management (34). From that collective corporate nature emerges the sense of individual responsibility showing signs of integrative efforts between administration, workers, managers, and owners, all resisting the fragmented top-down management hierarchy (81).

The notion of integrative unity is similar to how Deetz perceives good organizational communication that aligns internal and external diversity and different perspectives for the aim of keeping competition alive. Such an organizational act involves everyone in and out of the decision-making hierarchy. Subcultures are respected and different voices and backgrounds are invited to participate, all creating the recipe for generating creative solutions. Christensen et al. (*Corporate Communications*) propose an organizational diagnosis that centralizes the "communication effects thesis" as a managerial ideal. The communication effects thesis starts from realizing the information clutter affecting communication. Here, again, appears Schultz et al.'s (*The New Marketing Paradigm*) justification of integration that responds to the increasing trends of demassification. Ewen's (2001) examination of the American way of consumption that shifted between the early 1900s and the 1960s is an important explanation of the reversed patterns of mass production and consumption. Such a massification was aided by women's participation in the primary duties of the household from providing food to securing shelters. Unlike the 1920s and before, women's labor in the 1960s and after started to break from the degrading moral stereotyping. Wider consumer profiles of the working mother became the norm on television screens and advertisements. A consuming family started to draw more vibrant and diverse lifestyles by belonging to different ethnic groups or social tastes and interests. This holistic approach to integration from managing perception to corporate and organizational



practice is an actualization of IMC according to what Thorson and Moore call the “synergy of persuasive voices” between all stakeholders.

At the center of Follett’s philosophy lies an ethical and rhetorical attribute of discourse. Richard L. Lanigan presents an interesting study about dialogue in human communication studies, or communicology (“The Rhetoric of Discourse”). He explores the role of discourse within communication studies and how it drives the human capacity of being in the world while respecting Otherness and difference. Here, a notion like “constructive conflict” within organizational communication is “neither good nor bad; to consider it without ethical prejudice; to think of it not as warfare, but as the appearance of difference, difference of opinions, of interests” (Follett 1). It opens possibilities for dialogue to exist within a business environment.

Within classic public relations studies, Bernays’s *Crystalizing Public Opinion* presents integration according to the laws of maintaining harmony, or what he studies as the level of transparency between press and public relations professionals. Bernays says that public relations has three purposes and meanings: to inform, to persuade in order to achieve a certain attitude or action, and to “integrate” the perspective of institutions into the public and vice versa (3). For instance, the press works within the mass structure of human minds. It reflects the nature of a group, either stubborn or malleable, if they are mirroring or contradicting the public’s conscience and uniformity. The communicative capability of influencing new opinions or changing public behaviors through informing, persuading, or attaching corporeal perspectives into the public and vice versa is measured through the level of mutual communication between the two ends sharing the public sphere (3). Bernays’s background involved the psychological social structures underpinning human communication and how communication functions in forming public

opinion. Here, public opinion is a complex phenomenon because it deals with communally structured mass judgments inherited from one generation to the next, and not necessarily rationally thought about piece by piece. Here, the public relations practitioner deals with “sources of established beliefs,” either to assert them or to articulate new orientations (68). Bernays expands integration to a wider level that encompasses the public sphere compared to Follett’s organization-based approach.

Within contemporary public relations, maintaining this level of transparency between the public, the press, and public relations practices becomes a challenge. All IMC components, like advertising and public relations, attend to the consequences of the communication and information revolution manifesting in media fragmentation, functional illiteracy, the shift from the verbal to the visual, and the valuing of perceptions over facts to guide consumption decisions (Schultz et al., *Integrated*). Mass media offers unlimited connectivity beyond the possibilities of interpersonal communication. They highlight symbols and identity through verbalizing and visualizing cultural appearances. Many of the subconscious concepts in consumers’ minds come closer to the scenery of everyday life. Mass communication becomes an “amusement” and transmission of information (Postman). The notion of integration appears important to corporate image (Rebel). Image, here, is a combination of perceived impression and imagination. Impression is how the public receives the corporate entity in mind delivered through press releases, competitive brand noise, rumors, or any other official corporate word or action. Imagination, on the other hand, is the intersection of current experiences with memories of an organization in public’s mind (Rebel). The whole idea of managing public opinion and consensus management becomes a persuasive enterprise (Schultz et al., *Integrated*).

A holistic perspective of integration comes from marketing studies that value public, economic, and political discussions. In the edited book *The Future of Marketing*, Kitchen collects critical studies that attune to the needs and concerns of the twenty-first-century marketplace. The book builds on the history of marketing, from texts like Bartels's *The Development of Marketing Thought* (1962) and Levitt's *Marketing Myopia* (1960). Kitchen argues that in order to overcome the barriers to global integrated communication, marketing requires an organizational level of participation in the process of integration, a balance of marketplaces and marketspaces, a higher understanding of the consumer, an interaction with corporate communication, and a training in marketing principles for all practitioners. In *The Rhetoric and Reality of Marketing*, Kitchen touches upon marketing as a metaphor and an embodiment of exchange relationships. He gives a contextual understanding of marketing in eight first world countries, covering their marketing styles, the rhetorical representation of their marketing industries, and the ways in which managers drive marketing within their organizational cultures. The rhetorical approach to marketing is important to global IMC when discussing topics such as culturally relevant marketing strategies. Kitchen's rhetoric of marketing resonates with Kellogg's School of Promotional Management, which values relevant mindful practices (Iacobucci and Calder). In a study sponsored by Kellogg School, Burnett (2003) reported on the role of the marketing discipline to generalize workable strategies and to spread mindful practices on a corporate-wide level. Here, integrated marketing becomes "a philosophy of management in which the challenge is to drive the target customer perspective through all decisions" (Burnett 297). The way marketing activities integrate becomes a philosophy behind the "great marketing" that pays attention to customer problems (288). Burnett's observation

shows how marketing becomes an organizational endeavor that touches corporate audiences, customers, prospective publics, larger stakeholders, and employers.

A contemporary understanding of integration, as compared to earlier studies from organizational communication, public relations, and marketing, shows a paradigmatic shift in marketplace responses to the global transformation, touching on marketing communication discourse. In a widely cited article, Gould (2004) uses Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) and explores the dimensions of a paradigm shift in IMC discourse. Gould relies on Kitchen et al. ("The Emergence"), Cornelissen and Lock, Kitchen and Schultz (*Raising*), and others in sorting IMC as a set of post-structural practices and discourses. Gould also explores IMC as "a set of practices and discourses employed by marketing communications practitioners, studied by academic researchers, and taught by many of the latter to their students" and at the same time "as a subject for theoretical analysis" that strengthens IMC discourse (66). Here, post-structural theories attend to locality, Otherness, and multiplicity of meaning. Gould examines a GIMC framework that aims to maintain a holistic and transnational management style. The problem happens when the "vertical" line underpinning the promotional mix intersects with the "horizontal" line of corporate culture. Here, national culture becomes one of many variables that can be maintained or neglected. Something like irrelevant advertising, offensive messages, or misrepresentative images of the Other appear from the shortage of extracting and understanding local meanings. Integration, here, faces a managerial issue that complicates implementing unified cross-cultural strategies while maintaining cultural relevancy to the human consumer. Creating an international theme that brings cultural differences into unity has been always a challenge to multinational advertising agencies (Gould; Gould et al.; Grein and Gould; Ogilvy;) and public relations (Rebel).

It appears that Schultz's integration has solid foundation when it is unpacked in relation to public relations history (Bernays), organizational communication (Follett), and marketing rhetoric (Kitchen, *The Future; The Rhetoric*). The interaction with corporate communication (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Van Riel and Fombrun) and branding studies (Aaker) raises Schultz's views of integration as a market truth, happening from the moment that brands and consumers share the public sphere (Schultz, "The Inevitability"). What Schultz adds to other integration approaches is the role of corporate power in establishing communication consistency that values the human consumer throughout the process of managing public perception and reception (Kliatchko; Tafesse and Kitchen).

### **2.2.2. Toward a Humanistic Integration**

Before wrapping up conceptual discussions, this chapter will highlight the role of the humanistic dimension and the concept of integration in postmodern IMC. IMC, marketing communication, and corporate communication all work within the periphery of postmodern marketing theories (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Kitchen and De Pelsmacker; Kitchen and Uzunoglu). The marriage of IMC and corporate communication has been influenced by the digital revolution, which justifies the resonance of advertising and marketing departments to sales and after purchase management like customer service (Christensen et al., "Integrated Marketing Communication"; Cornelissen; Kerr and Kelly). Integration becomes both an internal and an external organizational mission that centralizes the human consumer (Kitchen and Uzunoglu).

Like other fields and areas of studies, postmodern IMC attends to the paradigmatic shift that characterizes knowledge production in the twenty-first century. Gould's approach to IMC as a set of post-structural practices and discourses is one illustration of the paradigm shift within

IMC that allows more qualitative methodologies to appear in the literature. Qualitative IMC research and the critical approaches within challenge “orthodox practices” and “what has been marginalized,” giving the primacy to locality while driving social change and emancipation (Daymon and Holloway). Qualitative IMC research discusses topics related to communication relationships in the social world (Fu) and the role of social structures in cultures in which marketing communication practices are embedded (Ewen). More qualitative studies go back to the rhetorical tradition (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Cornelissen; Kitchen 2003; Pursuit) and the study of philosophy of communication (Troup; Groom, “The Next Integration”). The linear, positivist research struggles with the fragmentary nature of relational and professional communication, while qualitative research embraces contextualized, culturally relevant, and diverse meaning-making options.

However, the criticisms of qualitative research as too subjective, difficult to reproduce, lacking transparency, and suffering generalization discourage IMC scholars from taking that route (Daymon and Holloway). They neglect the possibilities of meaning making by skipping toward generalized implications that cannot deal with the clutter of information and fragmentation, especially within global IMC. For instance, empirical studies classify that integration is either tactical or strategic, but does not critically explore the imbalance between utilizing the two levels (Kliatchko). Such an imbalance contributes to the conceptual fragmentation that characterizes IMC in the first place and continues to blur crucial discussions in the literature related to ethics and culture (Kliatchko).

From a critical constructive interpretive environment, establishing an IMC discourse that understands the primary role of humanistic integration is the first step before suggesting coordinates for IMC practitioners and teachers to discuss and implement integration as an ethical

communicative phenomenon. Humanistic integration highlights the blurred connections between the recognition of IMC as a culturally biased theory, the ethical practice of IMC, and the necessity of teaching IMC. Such a holistic discursive approach highlights its importance while creating culturally relevant integration and a pedagogically effective IMC teaching experience. Humanistic integration highlights the “how to” of responsible perception management that attends to the needs of the human consumer in the postmodern era (Kitchen and Uzunoglu). Such a humanistic perspective also attends to the rhetoric of reality (Kitchen, *The Rhetoric and Reality*), in which waves of skepticism along with narrative and virtue contention characterize the human understanding of the self, Otherness, and difference (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*). The humanistic approach to integration tackles the discrepancy between claiming IMC as a humanistic, consumer-based theory while, in reality, spreading culturally irrelevant practices to support one-voice branding strategies (Kliatchko). Adopting integration in global branding without sensitivity to cultural particularities or resonance to local target audiences contradicts the humanistic claims at the core of IMC. While IMC theorists aim for a humanistic and philosophically justified discipline, global brands meet several cultural challenges while representing the Other in media. Something like racial stereotyping (Fu; Kliatchko) within IMC campaigns enhances the practices of imposing false representations about the unknown Other. Integration, here, becomes a “commodification” of an idea that promises universal morality without a responsible justification of its substance (Fu).

Groom’s contribution to IMC’s humanistic turn comes from utilizing a reflexive methodology aided by philosophical perspectives (“The Next Integration”). “A philosophy of IMC is a phenomenological response to the intersection of modern and postmodern thinking,” carrying diverse voices within the literature (Groom, “The Next Integration”). Such a

philosophical entrance to IMC allows her to utilize the Gadamerian hermeneutics of “play” to describe the relationship between audiences and messages as an ongoing organized and fruitful labor. She unpacks the specifications and interplay of the hermeneutic space and place within IMC praxis. In the same interpretive horizon, Pursuit utilizes “epideictic rhetoric” and “rhetorical decorum” to assess ethical IMC practices and social media use. She extends and resonates with how humanistic advertising tends to actualize “respectful, not patronizing; dialogue-seeking, not monologic; responsive, not formula-driven” practices (Schultz et al., *Integrated*). While engaging the rhetoric of Cicero, Habermas’s philosophy of the public sphere, and Gerard Hauser vernacular theory, Pursuit suggests an IMC praxis that is attentive to the interplay of humanism, social media, and the role of commercial organization in forming cultures. Here appears the role of vernacular language formed by a discursive process of judgment and interpretation, which needs rhetorical competence (Hauser). What validates Pursuit and Groom’s interpretive efforts rooted in rhetoric and philosophy of communication is the postmodern acknowledgement of IMC.

Understanding IMC as a discourse based on the literature’s intersection with corporate communication, organizational communication, marketing rhetoric, and advertising history shows the strategic, tactical, and historical factors that shape the pursuit of humanistic consensus and perception management. As demonstrated, this chapter extracts strong arguments to support humanistic integration by covering conceptual issues, IMC and branding, IMC education, and IMC culture. Investing in the notion of integration uncovers respect for diversity and fragmentation resulting from the lack thereof throughout tactical unification of mediated voices. Integration highlights how the claims of human primacy only operate in reality if customers’ needs are met at customized, relevant, and respectful commercial experiences. By incorporating



the meaning of integration as perception management, as generalized by Schultz, its pedagogical dimensions in classrooms, and the historical background of integration within IMC literature, this chapter frames IMC as an independent and evolving discourse.

### **2.3. Conclusion**

Fragmentation is the word that describes the status of IMC literature. It manifests in the status of definitional issues that formed the emergence of the IMC field. Fragmentation also appears with the increasing role of media disintegration, the difficulty of measuring returns on investments, the challenges of globalization, inconsistencies in teaching IMC, and the multiplicity of definitions of the role of culture in the field. These consequences are added to the loss of conceptual consensus on the originality and validity of the idea of integration within marketing communication. It is a slow progress that delayed the field's development. Something like the notion of humanistic integration that is important to the uniqueness of IMC does not receive much scholarly attention compared to the volume of quantitative studies. Similarly, the contributions of Kitchen and Schultz and other corporate communication scholars to conceptualizing and centralizing integration has been receiving attention through years of scholarly development. The connection between integration and IMC definition, branding, measurement, media, globality, and culture also have been neglected. Envisioning a holistic discursive approach that is central to the role of culture in creating relevant integration and pedagogically effective IMC becomes a necessity. Such an emphasis on culture is just the first step before exploring integration as an ethical and communicative phenomenon in later chapters.

## Chapter 3

### Habermas and the Ethics of Discourse

Jürgen Habermas (b. 1929) is a well-known German philosopher and public intellectual. The scholarship he produces is shaped by a turbulent lived experience, like many other European philosophers. Around the 1940s, when World War II ended, Habermas was only fifteen years old, interacting like the rest of young adults at that time with the evil of their historical moment, the Nazi regime. It was a time sustained by neo-Marxist principles in which capitalism was a representation of an economic domination operating at odds with the essence of true freedom (Goodnight). By the late 1950s, Habermas started working with Theodor Adorno, engaging officially in the critical tradition of the Frankfurt School. His critical interests in the Frankfurt School resonated with the social phenomena created by World War II ramifications. His intellectual contribution has been influenced by collective philosophical principles appearing in systematic scholarly contributions, all crystalizing the role of society and communal ethics. His scholarship draws critical connections between the neo-Marxist project of democracy, the Kantian philosophy of reason, and the sociology of Max Weber and George Herbert Mead. Habermas has been a public intellectual figure with contradictory perspectives, for example when he refused the interventions in Serbia and Kosovo in the 1990s but supported the Gulf War against Iraq (Arneson, *Perspectives*). He is among Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Seyla Benhabib—scholars who recovered the rhetorical tradition through philosophical conversations (Hauser). Habermas retired from active teaching in 1994.

The interplay of Habermas's public sphere theory, notion of communicative rationality, and democratic cosmopolitanism points to ethical implications important to the commercial world and IMC discourse. First, in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*,

Habermas lays some foundations for discursive analysis when he examines bourgeois culture of eighteenth-century Europe. He argues that the notions of integration and disintegration are central to the cultural transformation resulting from changes in producing public opinion and media. *The Structural Transformation* points to an early conceptualization of Habermas's communicative rationality, which appears later in *The Theory of Communicative Action* (two volumes). At the center of communicative rationality comes the discourse ethics model with philosophical justifications and moral characteristics. Communicative action becomes the good that the discourse ethics model protects and promotes. By reading these two books in parallel, it appears that discourse ethics gains the ability to elevate the moral discourse depending on the norms of argumentation and communicative competence (Habermas, *Volume 1; Between Facts*). In *The Postnational Constellation*, Habermas's response to the Kantian critique of reason that grounds his democratic cosmopolitanism should not be forgotten. Such a criticism became the center of his debate with Foucault. Habermas critiques subject-centered reason that contains hidden forms of oppression and domination in the dynamic of political, cultural, and institutional settings. While operating in a lifeworld colonized by media-steered systems, discourse ethics helps find universal morality between the interplay of "discourse principles" (extracted from moral, ethical, and pragmatic argumentative norms) and "moral principles" (Habermas, *Between Facts*).

What remains uncovered is the reflection on this metaphorical intersection and the role of that discussion on envisioning a humanistic integration for IMC discourse. This invites the role of critical philosophy of communication ethics, or critical communication ethics. Habermas adds a rich critical background to philosophy of communication and communication ethics, carried by argumentation, reasoning, and socio-philosophical justifications. Here, Habermas enriches the

interpretive methodology of philosophy of communication ethics that points to Otherness, dialogical attentiveness, and negotiation (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*). Habermas's discursive analysis of the public sphere (*The Structural Transformation*) and communicative rationality (*Volume 2*) tracks the life cycle of discourse ethics carried by moral philosophy, philosophy of communication, and applied communication studies. He offers a version of integration that looks for the quality of language, the nature of engagement in human interaction, and the modes of validating argumentation. Such a conceptual net, when added to Habermas and Foucault's understanding of discourse and power, becomes important to IMC studies. The purpose of exploring Habermas's critical communication ethics becomes the first step before utilizing the practical means of discourse as a production of knowledge and as the bridge to communicative rationality. A humanistic version of integration grounded in communication ethics is essential to how IMC produces knowledge and shapes reality within global branding.

Social integration is an overall understanding of the communicative act that characterizes Habermas's critical communication ethics. It appears in his examination of the bourgeois public sphere (*The Structural Transformation*). It becomes more philosophically solid in his communicative rationality theories (*Volume 2*). It also appears in his revisions of the Kantian democratic cosmopolitanism (*The Postnational Constellation*). The three theories intersect to solidify a version of discourse ethics that attends to the reality of the commercial world. Throughout the discursive interplay of the three metaphors there emerges a discourse ethics model that is humanistic in nature, respectful of cultural particularities, and attentive to Otherness. It has the potential to explore and criticize from a communicative perspective the dimensions of commodifying humanity that sustain corporate, branding, and mediated practices.

Chapter 4 guided by Said's illustration of the Foucauldian discourse is all about that idea of commodification when it is done by textual misrepresentation. This chapter focuses on Habermas's discourse ethics as an important model to critical communication ethics.

### **3.1. Critical Philosophy of Communication Ethics**

Critical philosophy of communication ethics, or critical communication ethics, is an interpretive area of study based on the interplay of criticism, philosophy of communication, moral philosophy, and applied communication (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*; Karolak). Representatives of the critical tradition within philosophy of communication or communication ethics are philosophers such as Habermas (Goodnight), Hannah Arendt (Arnett, *Communication Ethics*), Zygmunt Bauman (Lipari), and Seyla Benhabib. Critical communication ethics is just one approach among different interpretive methodologies such as hermeneutics, phenomenology, epistemology, and rhetorical theory, which all intersect to make meanings. Communication philosopher Calvin O. Schrag shows through his intellectual journey how these methodologies intersect. In an interview, Schrag stated that a

philosophy of whatever stripe never speaks with a single voice and that if the conversation is to continue it should behoove us to strive to communicate in spite of differences. A multiplicity of voices is needed in the philosophical task, a multiplicity of voices that, in a sense, always remains too narrow. (Ramsey and Miller 5)

For instance, hermeneutical methodology discusses communicative issues in light of Hans-Georg Gadamer and the European literary criticism (Palmer). Gadamer advances a constructive hermeneutic approach to philosophy of communication that has roots in St. Augustine and Vico's rhetorical tradition. The interpretive methodology of critical communication ethics intersects with Gadamerian hermeneutics in criticizing the inadequacy of the positivistic

consciousness (Ottmann). Phenomenology, on the other hand, is the study of experience and consciousness coming in its modern version from the efforts of Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty (Lanigan, “The Rhetoric of Discourse”). Deetz et al. highlight a version of critical phenomenology that explores normative critique and socially formed practices. Critical communication ethics inspired by Hannah Arendt also starts important discussions about communicative responsiveness, critique of modernity, and potentials for the derivative self to engage with the world and Otherness (Arnett, *Communication Ethics*). Benhabib gives a multi-disciplinary critical approach that connects Habermas’s discourse ethics, the Kantian tradition of moral autonomy, Hegel’s counter-Kantian critique, and communitarianism critical criticism that centralizes Otherness and diversity. She is an important scholar in dialogic communication ethics (Arnett, *Dialogic Confession*), media ethics studies (Littlejohn and Foss), study of culture and diversity (Benhabib), and study of diversity and public relations (Haas). From prioritizing intersubjectivity between multiple sociocultural contexts there appears the “concrete other” grounded in cultural and social contextualization (Benhabib). The concrete other has the right to participate in the communicative act.

Critical communication ethics has ancient roots in the search for happiness, moral unity, and truth (Arnett et al., “Communication Ethics”; Chesebro; Frenz; Hyde, “Ethics”; Johnstone). Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* originates the pragmatics of communication ethics in the notion of *phronēsis*, the ancient understanding of practical wisdom. Releasing the practice of generating wisdom from its abstract nature emerges through either the intellectual virtue of reasoning and thinking or through moral virtue (Aristotle 65). The practicality of unpacking wisdom, here, becomes a broad system of guidance for the search for the good life, human happiness, and the role of virtues in reaching that goal. By leaning on moral philosophy and

*phronēsis*, communication ethics frees this area of study from rigid abstractive theories that diminish listening to communicative particularities within any inquiry in hand (Arneson, *Communicative Engagement*). Searching for moral unity within the interplay of discourse and actions continues to appear in modern moral philosophy (Frentz).

In *A Short History of Ethics: A History of Moral Philosophy from the Homeric Age to the Twentieth Century* (1988), Alasdair MacIntyre contributes important efforts to Western modern philosophy by utilizing institutional frameworks to explore different topics. He examines how democratic policy protects the good and the practice of virtue, the quality of language, the nature of engagement, and modes of validating argumentation. Throughout these discussions, MacIntyre's analysis becomes important for questions of difference, cultural context, and the role of narratives in shaping traditions, which are important for communication ethics. The idea of emotivism as an ethical relativism represents a moral source that can be blurred by personal preferences, desire, or the divorce from historical grounds (MacIntyre, *A Short History*). Ethical relativism offers an escape from "absolutist ethical principles," especially in the realm of competing narratives (Johnstone). Emotivism challenges reasoning that is structured on flexibility, faith over facts, and the dynamic nature of "human commitment" (Johnstone). Modern critical communication ethics provides just one approach to focus on the ethical moral inquiry that engages in systematic questioning, answering, and criticism.

The critical inquiries within contemporary communication ethics have been under the supervision of the National Communication Association (NCA) since the early 1980s, unpacking different metaphors, contexts, and topics. Studies explore dialogic communication (Arnett, *Communication and Community; Dialogic Confession*; Arnett and Arneson; Arnett and Cooren; Lipari), democratic, contextual, and universal-humanitarian ethics (Benhabib). The contexts of

critical communication ethics appear within public sphere theories (*Communication Ethics in Dark Times* 2013), corporate communication, crisis, and leadership (Arnett et al., *Corporate Communication Crisis*), or in the ethics of economic justice (Schaefer et al.).

For instance, universal-humanitarian communication ethics is one of six approaches that drive the pragmatic goodness of communication ethics (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*). This approach unpacks notions such as commitment to the Other's potentiality, institutionalizing procedures for discourse ethics' reason or moral understanding, public morality, goodness, creativeness, perfection, and responsiveness to transcendent ideals (Arnett, *Levinas's Rhetorical Demand*). It depends on twelve major studies that highlight relational aspects within ethical studies (Arnett et al., "Communication Ethics"). DiTomaso et al. highlight the dynamic role of procedural ethics, which can benefit pedagogical development within business education. Instead of chasing ethical values, creating systematic and procedural ethics is important to encounter issues like the rise of

institutional investors, the saturation of domestic markets...that contributed to globalization..., the decline of unions..., the erosion of the minimum wage and...the push of African Americans out of the paid labor force in preference for the exploitation of immigrants. (DiTomaso et al. 148)

All such issues contain a moral question that stands short in front of the subjectivity of art, the objectivity of science and religion, or the commodification of humanity. At least that is how Habermas's critical philosophy interprets the universalization of morality and the role of "discourse ethics" within (Habermas, 2: 92).

Discourse ethics is an important Habermasian umbrella of ideas in which communicatively structured morality replaces sacred-based historical societies. It appears more



mature when carried by *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Habermas states that “neither science nor art can inherit the mantle of religion; only a morality, set communicatively aflow and developed into a discourse ethics, can replace the authority of the sacred in this respect” (Habermas, 2: 92). Habermas’s faith in the communicative act behind driving argumentation liberates morality from the hegemony of the sacred. Even science and art stand short in absorbing some sacred traditions. Here appears the principles of moral philosophy and its reflexive ability to “articulate, refine, and elaborate” solid and social presuppositions (McCarthy x). Moral philosophy’s role “is to clarify from a reflexive or reconstructive perspective the normative foundations of human action, communication, and the interaction” (Arens 47). Reaching truth, here, becomes an intersubjective enterprise rooted in the socialization and the discursive procedure to unpacking validate claims. The opposite is true. Deetz observes how the systematic and strategic application of power occurs when truth claims resists the discursive procedure. Within discourse ethics, “the rational meaning of normative validity” replaces the “archaic core of the normative” (Habermas, 2: 92). Rational normative validations are the “discourse principles” made of moral, ethical, or pragmatic presuppositions and norms that can elevate mere “procedurally regulated bargaining” (*Between Facts*).

This interplay of “discourse principles” and “moral principles” help find universal morality and “the ideal community of communication” (Habermas, *Between Facts*). It is “a community that thrives on the capacity for acknowledgment and thus the open-mindedness of its participants toward each other and toward discovering the truth of some matter of concern” (Hyde, “Ethics”). Here, the communicative act needs “comprehensible expression” directed toward a recipient’s “rhetorical situation,” which is agreed upon based on being in an argument (Hyde, “Ethics”). Habermas brings discourse ethics to an ontological level that features human

existence and the acknowledgment of others, both highlighting the importance of notions like open-mindedness, conscience-formation, and civility.

Habermas's philosophy and discourse ethics have been utilized and explored to support research in universal humanitarian communication ethics. Discourse ethics is carried by another important Habermasian notion: the ideal speech situation. This refers to the structure that is "immunized against repression and inequality in a special way" (Habermas, 1: 26). The pragmatics of such a situation appear in the different aspects of the argumentative speech. It has a process, a procedure, and an ability to produce cogent arguments. Habermas's ideal speech situation allows a coercion-free communicative program to emerge in which different opposing perspectives are all relevant. Gunson and Collins bring discourse ethics to institutional reality by highlighting the procedures and characteristics of the ideal speech situation. Benhabib goes further and explores the universalistic ideals in connection to Habermas's critical philosophy. She interrogates the supremacy of Western rationality from the concerns of modernity itself, which "saps the bases of solidaristic coexistence in the name of profit and competition" (2). Something like global economic inflation puts basic human needs in comparison with human dignity. Benhabib confronts the criticism of modern universalistic ideals with the postmodern rejection of a grand narrative, like in the work of Foucault and Lyotard.

Narrative communication ethics, on the other hand, is another domain that values the symbolic enterprise of storytelling guiding history and cultures. Walter Fisher's narrative paradigm, central on the "*Homo narrans*...assumes that a communication ethic begins with persons' lives guided by stories about the way the world is or should be, protecting and promoting the good residing within given narratives" (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy* 59). Narrative communication ethics has a place within postmodern historiography and

the ontological pursuit within, through valuing the role of rhetoric in shaping history, the past, and its narrative expression (Arneson, *Communicative Engagement*). Narrative as a public agreement on shared stories creates a “rhetorical dynamic” and a communal “enthymeme” (Schrag, *Communicative Praxis*). It becomes the “communicative background” in guiding decision making (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*) and “rhetorical conversations” that are sensitive to past, present, and future communal stories (Frentz). The ethical dimension within shared narrative appears through dialogic civility as the common ground within public communicative space (Arnett and Arneson). This “interplay of theory, action, and contextual discernment” within different philosophies of communication ethics all control the embedded agency according to ethical limitations (Arnett et al., “Communication Ethics”; *Communication Ethics Literacy*). Narrative, universal-humanitarian, and contextual communication ethics all depart from the meaning of boundary and limitation embedded within a story, a context, or within the means of humanity.

Critical communication ethics becomes important to applied communication studies and practices. Critical communication ethics help the exploration of theoretical, practical, and academic/philosophical discourses in universal, global, particular, local, rational, and emotional contexts (Cheney et al., *Handbook*). The operative domain of critical communication includes ideas, practices, processes, institutions, events of communicative expression, circulation, and exchange (Cheney et al., *Handbook*). Critical communication ethics discuss how the communication discipline (both in theory and practice) allows and aids ethics as the philosophical study of moral inquiry to flourish and grow. It has different approaches, such as tackling free speech, Kantian universalism and discourse ethics, neoliberal rhetoric, and cultural

contextualism (Cheney et al., *Handbook*). Here appears the role of rhetorical tradition in covering issues vital to the mass, public, and interpersonal discourses.

The “rhetorical turn” within communication ethics has a “foreground,” persuasive, and values-laden factors (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy* 43). The rhetorical turn helps to unpack the symbolic capacity of dwelling places in order to stimulate social, psychological, aesthetic, and theological constructs. It is a rhetorical turn developed based on Heidegger’s ontological and phenomenological philosophy of communication, which explores the capacity of human being. Hyde (*The Life-Giving Gift*) brings Heidegger into conversation with different philosophers like Habermas, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Paul Ricœur, Jacques Derrida, and Emmanuel Levinas in whose work the rhetorical ethos and its ontological nature become an important premise in guiding logic and “*domains* of thought” (insert citation). Ethos becomes the source of multi relations between the self, “communal existence,” God, Being, and discourse (Hyde, *The Life-Giving Gift*). Postmodernity and the rise of competing “petite narratives” increase the attention to the significance of language in interpreting rhetorical actions (Lyotard), and here appears the role of communication ethics (Hyde, *The Life-Giving Gift*).

This wide scope of critical communication ethics allows multiple interpretations of the Kantian “substantive good” and “oughtness” to emerge from a culturally and geographically situated virtue system (Arnett et al., “Communication Ethics”; *Communication Ethics Literacy*). In a pioneering study within the field, Vernon Jensen explains how oughtness always operates in constant tension between “what is” and “what *ought to be*” (5). It can be “prescriptive,” used in setting the measurements and the end bar, or “descriptive,” presupposing that the high ends are insufficient. Ethics becomes the “moral responsibility to choose, intentionally and voluntarily, oughtness in values like rightness, goodness, truthfulness, justice, and virtue, which may, in a

communicative transaction, significantly affect ourselves and other” (Jensen 4). From such a distinction, communication ethics grounds its principle in challenging the calls to absolute judgments (Arnett et al., “Communication Ethics”). Jensen also sets the difference between ethics and morals that communication ethics studies adopt later (Arnett et al., “Communication Ethics”; *Communication Ethics Literacy*; Bracci). From within different forms, formats, and purposes of communication, communication ethics explores what it means to reach an ethical dialogical self that extracts its intellectual support from moral philosophy. This is one level of communication ethics that works on exploring the dimensions of the self.

There is also the social level. James Chesebro explores the role of social values within fabrics of societies. He examines the history of communication in order to track the importance of theoretical or conceptual ethics. He conceptualizes three constructs important to communication ethics. Communication should be responsive to social identity, to history, and to cultural integrity. Those communicative constructs work according to specific ethical, social, political, universal, or humanistic standards, and they control public communication. Chesebro’s ethical construct shapes the development and direction of communication ethics studies, producing an early categorization of democratic ethics, procedural standards and codes, universal humanitarian ethics, and contextual ethics (Arnett et al., “Communication Ethics”). Narrative ethics have been extended upon and supported in later scholarship (Arnett et al., “Communication Ethics”). Chesebro’s construct has also been used to examine the role of media in constituting sociocultural and “perspective” systems (Chesebro; Chesebro and McMahan). For instance, Chesebro explores the notion of individualism as represented by entertainment media in the late 1970s, 80s, and 90s. Gradually, primetime TV shows and newspaper companies developed their own perspective systems. Accordingly, individualism developed from being a

vague term that promoted symbolic conflicts to being the ideal that justifies new types of authorities to emerge.

Critical communication ethics is a methodology grounded in philosophy of communication, applied communication, and moral philosophy. It connects to different philosophies of communication like the one rooted in hermeneutics, phenomenology, or the rhetorical tradition. Principles of moral philosophy, such as Kantian oughtness and the Aristotelian ethos, legitimize the ability of critical communication to explore ethical discussions posed by theoretical shortages or marketplace complexities.

### **3.2. Habermas's Critical Communication Ethics**

Habermas's discourse ethics is important to communication ethics in general, not just the universal humanitarian research. By aligning three concepts—the public sphere, communicative rationality, and democratic cosmopolitanism—the Habermasian response to the Enlightenment critique of reason enriches his version of critical communication ethics. In *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Habermas presents the Western public sphere as an invitation to diversity, difference, and integration. His examination of the bourgeois patterns of communication and public interaction departed from a reflective project toward a critical background for communicative rationality and ethical judgement. In *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Habermas extends his exploration of the communicative act to conceptualize discourse ethics. He utilizes the Kantian philosophy of moral autonomy, communicative action and language, the public sphere theory, and more.

Habermas structures communicative rationality based on a response to the Kantian critique of reason, or what is known as the theory of democratic cosmopolitanism. Habermas's theory of cosmopolitanism is a counter-discourse to different forms of domination and

oppression emerging from an ultimate faith in subject-centered reason (Schmidt). The theory of cosmopolitanism illustrates Habermas's perception of distorted communication as it appears in communal injustice in political, cultural, social, or institutional settings (Goodnight). Habermas's treatment of Kantian cosmopolitanism distinguishes his philosophy from Foucault's critique of reason and power, which is important to Chapter 4 of this dissertation. A special discussion on Habermas and Foucault's debate will follow in section 3.3. because it is important to justify Said's use of the Foucauldian discourse theory. Ultimately, Habermas presents a version of communication ethics that roots its richness and possibilities of meanings in procedural perspectives that work in setting appropriate communicative conducts in the public sphere (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*). While searching for an ideal community of communication, he establishes a common ground that connects different philosophical projects, like skepticism, antagonism, and the Nietzschean nihilism, that interrogate institutional power.

Habermas is a philosopher with wide contributions to sociology, moral issues, and political philosophy in a "meta-hermeneutic" (Ottmann). *The Structural Transformation* along with Marshall McLuhan's *Gutenberg Galaxy*, Eric Havelock's *Preface to Plato*, and Jacques Ellul's *Propaganda* all formed a "critical impulse" within the history of communication studies between the 1950s and 60s (Simonson et al.). This critical direction was formed by the rise of multidisciplinary approaches to communication history influenced by the introduction of the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research in the US in the 1940s. There appears the intersection of communication studies with sociology, social theory, and philosophy. This cross-disciplinary reading characterizes early Habermas's critical theory with an "emancipatory interest" (McCarthy) and "instrumental reason" (Outhwaite). Outhwaite explains that emancipatory interest happens through "scientization of politics, the transformation of practical, moral-political

questions, into technical ones” (21). According to the modern enlightenment principles, emancipation requires rationality, and it rejects unjustified power and domination. Dennis Mumby emphasizes Habermas’s interests in the power-ethics relationship within his “emancipatory impulse of modernity” (page number).

However, Habermas replaces the Kantian transcendental structure of consciousness with a linguistic and communicative rationality. The sources of moral action and judgement become communal through dialogic interaction rather than solitary moral consciousness. Critical thinking, truth, and ethics together form the “communicative context” (Mumby). For Habermas, communication is unethical as long as it prevents systematically distorted communication. Instead, dialogue and communal interaction actualize the interactional power of discourse, its cognitive qualities, and its ability to hold universal norms. Habermas defends universal philosophy as a revised version of Kantianism through dialectical construction. His reception of the Enlightenment project is philosophically reconstructive to overcome the shortage of reason. That appears through his criticism of twentieth-century colonialism, abuse of industrial revolution, and the impact of technology on moral progress resulting from ramifications of World War II (Goodnight).

For instance, Habermas rejects Gadamer’s philosophical or constitutive hermeneutics as too relativistic because it engages with linguistic and cultural meanings and fails to interrogate ideologies (Schrag, *Communicative Praxis* 49). The hidden ideologies can be the reason behind limiting participation in dialogic communication ethics (Arnett, “The Practical Philosophy”). McCarthy’s introduction of Volume 2 of *The Theory of Communicative Action* interprets the notion of communicative distortion in a way that justifies Habermas’s resistance of this Gadamerian “hermeneutic idealism.” Habermas utilizes artifacts involving cultural, social,



institutional, and communicative dynamics to reexamine grounded communicative norms and criticize distorted communication (Goodnight). Communicative distortion in market relations come from the roots of injustice, which controls community and communication on various levels created by economic, administrative, and legitimation systems (Habermas, *Legitimation* 34). Habermas departs from social theory to frame his understanding of the “lifeworld.” Society, here, can be the fabric that sorts and regulates social actions. It can also be the self-regulating system in which actions are monitored according to their functionality and consequences. The hermeneutic labor within the communicative action in both understandings of society is inevitable, and from here comes the disconnection between Habermas and Gadamer. Leaning toward hermeneutic idealism can prevent a holistic observation of social connections and consequences within daily practices. Accordingly, problems like the individual autonomy of the interpreter or hegemony of culture prevent a systematic distortion from appearing to guide communicative rationality.

What remains important between Habermas and Gadamer becomes a sense of balance between hermeneutics and social theory that regulates the lifeworld. Gadamer offers such a balance when he emphasizes the role of “historicity, situatedness, and embeddedness of perception that naturally results in prejudice or bias in the act of interpretation” (Arnett and Holba 88). He invests in exploring meaning making that is historically situated in tradition. Gadamer’s existential hermeneutics is rooted in what is right before us rather than in abstract truths, such as for Habermas. It is an idea that originates from Husserl’s “life-world” in *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (1970) and from Heidegger’s notions of historicity, situatedness, and thrownness. Gadamer also departs from Aristotelian *mimesis* as a form of imitation that does not duplicate reality but makes escaping the role of

historical moment inevitable (Arnett and Holba 88). As a result, the Enlightenment project for Gadamer fails by claiming a neutrality and objectivity that is not fully accessible in reality.

Meaning making, for Habermas, has different origins. It emerges from the pragmatic and instrumentality of the ideal speech (the systematically distorted communication) toward finding a truth untouched by “projected consensus” (Schrag, *Communicative Praxis* 61). The notion of community becomes the moral parameter for acknowledgment and open-mindedness between its members toward Otherness and toward discovering the truth from within difference. Habermas argues that “ideologically distorted claims” can hit people, contrasting Gadamer when he claims that “we cannot escape prejudice” (Arnett and Holba 88). The more prevention of distorted communication, the more unethical means of communication appear to surface. For contextualized exploration of Habermas’s communication ethics, the next two sections will focus on illustrations and meanings from his theory of the public sphere (*The Structural Transformation*) as well as from the notion of communicative rationality (*Volumes 1 and 2*). Habermas’s theories of the public sphere and communicative action offer their moral and critical dimensions and provide a discursive framework (discourse ethics) that is important for IMC and humanistic ethical integration.

### **3.2.1. Public Sphere Theory**

In *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Habermas visualizes a case of “Disintegration of the Bourgeois Public Sphere” through examining the origins and formation of Western public opinion. Its theoretical foundation comes from nineteenth- and twentieth-century philosophers like Marx, Weber, Mead, Parsons, Adorno, and Horkheimer. Disintegration in the public sphere is a systematic process that extracts journalism and literary production from the political sphere. The technical integration of journalism and *belles lettres* shaped a case of

cultural transformation central to the role of speech in the public sphere. Journalism represented the social mechanism of communicative rationality back then, while *belles lettres* operated as an aesthetic form of literary entertainment. Habermas states,

The public sphere...became an arena of competing interests fought out in the coarser forms of violent conflict. Laws passed under the “pressure of the street” could hardly be understood any longer as embodying the reasonable consensus of publicly debating private persons. They corresponded more or less overtly to the compromise between competing private interests. (*The Structural Transformation* 132)

In the bourgeois culture, public information lifted the boundaries and authorities of the private sphere and created new realities. The role of the press in the social psychology of the eighteenth century generated a “pseudo-public” and “sham-private world of culture consumption” from within the literary public sphere (160, 162, 169). News became accessible to the larger public as packaged goods owned by private associations, which have their independent voices away from the state’s political interest. These transformations affected the public from being “culture-debating” to “culture-consuming” (159).

Mass media became a form of a culture of integration that directed critical thinking, journalism, and novels into a new form of entertainment. Newer media such as radio, television, and films delivered the pleasant and convenient entertainment to be enjoyed in the privacy of homes, keeping the human interest away from rational-critical reflection on information. The “pseudo-privatized” culture of integration invited advertising and “super slogan” into the process of public relations with a new function helpful to political propaganda and economic agendas (Habermas, *The Structural Transformation* 175). This kind of integration has the taste of “advice” that the public needs (159). Public discourse became responsible for learning from the

public good through making decisions and “public accountability” (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*). The new face of public communication lost that institutional power when reading and watching television became private acts. The “public sphere in the world of letter” transformed the citizen from being reflective on culture to being a consuming agent (Habermas, *The Structural Transformation* 175), and the mission of allocating public consensus became a new challenge. This tension between private and public spheres was caused by tension between social reproduction, market economy, and political power.

In critical communication ethics, public sphere theory is important. It has been widely utilized in communication studies and rhetoric (Hauser), communication ethics (Benhabib), and philosophy of communication (Arnett and Holba). What Habermas adds to the Western public sphere is an understanding of the public as a place of diversity, difference, and integration, all envisioned from the bourgeois society of eighteenth-century France, Germany, and England. Gerard Hauser in *Vernacular Voices* (1999) takes Habermas’s public sphere theory into the rhetorical realm. He aligns the notions of the public, the public sphere, public opinion, and public memory in a conversation important for political deliberation. Hauser initiates a dialogic listening that appreciates diversity and multiplicity of public opinions that constitute the entire public sphere, the virtual mediated world, and the communities within (Arnett and Fritz). He views the public sphere as a discursive space that has a place for ordinary people to participate in generating public opinion. Hauser says,

The critical examination of discourse permits one to decipher rhetoric’s vital role of symbolically constituting experience and relations. Moreover, by examining discourse we can uncover how society invests its rhetorical creations in cultural legitimation of self-generating activities by which it produces itself: the attempts of social actors to control

values and norms, to overcome subjugation from dominant groups or institutions, and to appropriate and reappropriate their own *historicity*. (116)

The open-ended rhetorical role in symbolically constituting experiences and relations becomes a feature of the public sphere. This makes socially generated discourses as important as cultural representation of the self and the community. The rhetorical power emerging from public discursive spaces allows for humanistic values and norms to emerge, for excluded groups and minorities to participate, and for everyone to write their own history based on legitimate and solid cultural activities. It is a rhetorical background rooted in Hegelian-based moral philosophy that distinguishes between facts and norms, morals and ethics (Aune).

Farrell takes Habermas closer to the “norms of the rhetorical culture” (149). He explores *phronēsis*, or practical reasoning, in light of Habermas’s public sphere and discourse ethics in order to offer a Habermasian version of universal pragmatics. Habermas’s early works are more relevant to the German Enlightenment project, surrounded by theoretical and practical obligations coming from social theory. He chose the critical route to examine the public sphere and left it to moral philosophy to ground communicative rationality. The alignment of the two notions established the conceptual foundations for his discourse ethics model. Describing universalism as pragmatics, then, attends to the specifications of rhetorical utterance. The “true” becomes truthful only if it represents “something in the world,” while the *right* should follow social expectations (Farrell). As a result, the value of speech manifests insofar as it grounds communicative rationality within different argumentations. Farrell works with rhetorical hope in the ability of Habermas’s critical discourse to overcome the shortage of characterizing the rhetoric-to-reason relationship.

Raymie McKerrow provides more specifications of this Habermasian rhetorical construct of the public sphere. It should attend to reason, time, space, composition, and mediated existence to ensure equality in public participation. Illustrating these notions in the economic sphere, Andrew Arato (1982) argues that activating or legitimating ideologies does not happen without economic support guided by the cultural lifeworld. That is narrative background in the vocabulary of communication ethics. When the bourgeois disintegrated, democracy and capitalism separated into different sub-realms within the public sphere. Nancy Love explores “what is left of Marx” when it comes to preserving or discussing humanity. When the democratic structure occupied communicative rationality, capitalism was left to the “syndromes of civil and familial-vocational privatism” as the new form of public privilege (Love 54). The commodification and accumulation of status, symbols, consumer goods, and leisure time, which Habermas grounds in Protestant ethics, gradually freed the market from liberal constitutions. The Marxian understanding of “commodity fetishism” became sealed within modernity (Habermas, *Volume 2*). It legitimizes and replaces the feudal system of bourgeois culture.

In “Power and Ethics,” Mumby explains how commodification works within American capitalism. For instance, the virtues of individualism, as in promoting the discourse of equal job opportunities and gender equality, limits the working class from thinking about capitalism at large. Discussions of excessive labor hours and low wages receive little attention from the public. Accordingly, the whole discussion of communication, marketplace, and ethics becomes obscured. The interrelation of communication, ethics, and economy presents a discursive-rhetorical analysis in which the market is just a single aspect of human behavior important for discussions on consequence, duties, and virtue. With the power of discourse in the hand of

capitalism and disciplinary institutions, finding truth and creating the system of exclusion become a matter of communicative competence, impacting speaking and writing (Ijsseling).

Habermas's examination of the bourgeois public sphere surpasses situated reflection of a specific historical moment. He discursively examines the democratic-socialist reorganization of late-capitalist societies informed by the interplay of Anglo-American and Continental traditions. He tracks the transformation and emergence of different cultures, the culture of letter, the consuming culture, and the debating culture. The tension between private and public spheres (caused by tension between social reproduction and growth of the market economy versus political power) provides insights for rhetorical studies and philosophy of communication. He offers important insights about the role of commodifying social ideas in shaping new realities. Habermas started a critical reflection that later became a guidance for communicative rationality, judgement, and guiding ethical argumentations.

### **3.2.2. Communicative Rationality**

*The Theory of Communicative Action* with its two volumes comes as an extension to *The Structural Transformation* and as a scholarly reorientation toward reasoning and argumentation stemmed from the communicative act (Outhwaite). Within the two volumes of the book, the theory of communicative rationality inaugurates Habermas's critical philosophy grounded in Weber's *Theory of Social and Economic Organizations* and Parson and Mead's sociology, not neglecting the German Enlightenment traditions and the role of Kantian philosophy within. He aligns Kantian philosophy on moral autonomy, communicative action and language, and the public sphere theory to conceptualize discourse ethics as a systematic inquiry into human communicative action. Communicative action opens discussions addressing modernity and

postmodernity, language and society, critical theory, the transformation of the sacred, democracy, and more (Honneth and Joas).

Habermas starts with viewing rationalization as a social-theoretical pursuit represented by a paradigm shift in modern sociology. He understands the role of rationalization through the notion of community. Within communicative rationality, a community can reach “consensus,” characterized by an involvement between communicative agency and a speaker’s knowledge (Habermas, 2: 187). Habermas utilizes the philosophies of George Herbert Mead (1863–1931) and Emile Durkheim (1858–1917). Both Mead and Durkheim expand Weber’s philosophy in which communicative rationality “cannot be dealt with adequately within the conceptual frame of the philosophy of consciousness” (Habermas, 2: 1). Mead invests in linguistics. He takes the communication-theoretic foundation of sociology, which solidifies the role of linguistically mediated interactions. Nonverbal forms of communication are examined here, like analyzing gestures and signal languages (Habermas, *Volume 2* 2). By doing so, Mead tracks the linguistic roots of the “rationalized lifeworld,” which is made of complicated symbolic networks and sacred connotations (Habermas, *Volume 2* 2). Durkheim then stretches Weber’s theory of rationalization toward a theory of social solidarity by connecting social integration to system integration. Social integration is a communicative act, and it has three characteristics: it transmits culturally stored knowledge, in which action is the medium that keeps reproducing cultural traditions; it puts norms in theory-appropriate contexts; and it constructs an internal control on behaviors and on the formation of personality structures (Habermas, *Volume 2* 5). The idea of internal control on behavior comes from Mead, indicating socialization processes that take place via linguistically mediated interaction.



Speaking of the instrumental reasoning that characterizes Habermas's critical communication ethics (McCarthy; Outhwaite), the theory of communicative action clearly illustrates the possibilities of rational communicative acts. It offers a modern understanding of the self (Arnett et al., "Communication Ethics"; Chesebro) that makes use of "procedural inclusion" (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*). Ramsey and Miller in a conversation with Schrag, the professor in philosophy of communication, explain the instrumentality of communication in Habermas's writing. Communication, here, is instrumental because it needs pre-approval from specific validity claims before it can be constitutive of knowledge. Communication can be cognitive, evaluative, or aesthetic, and that is what Habermas fails to recognize (Ramsey and Miller). Communication, here, is tied to a legitimizing process specific to each domain of knowledge. Schrag explains that validity claims are highly controlled by communicative competence and the use of language serving argumentation. As long as communication is able to provide resources for argumentation, whether cognitive, ethical, or aesthetic, then communication can validate the claims in hand.

Habermas's communicative rationality or socially-based rationality has been examined in relation to the role of language in exploring truth and justice (Cooren). This is important to different views of modern power (Mumby) and power and domination (Deetz). Communicative rationality is also important to criticism of persuasion in the economic context through questioning moral and ethical gaps and examining the symbolic dimensions of the human experience (Schaefer et al. 436). The notion of communicative rationality is all about the interplay of discourse and criticism in a lifeworld colonized by "expert cultures" and failing institutions (Goodnight 93).

Both public sphere theory and communicative rationality ground Habermas's discourse ethics. Discourse ethics is a model developed by different philosophers such as Karl Otto Apel and Habermas. Apel comes from a transcendental-pragmatic framework while Habermas comes from a theory of communicative action and ethics (Arens). Habermas comes with a discourse ethics model as a response to MacIntyre's criticisms of the moral theorists of the Enlightenment. He utilizes argumentation, reasoning, and the role of socio-philosophical justifications to conceptualize rational discourse ethics (*Between Facts*). He extracts discourse principles from moral, ethical, or pragmatic argumentative norms that can elevate mere "procedurally regulated bargaining" (*Between Facts*). The potential of discourse ethics to elevate the moral discourse depends on the norms of argumentation and communicative competence. While operating in a lifeworld colonized by media steered systems, discourse ethics helps to find universal morality from the interplay of discourse principles and moral principles. Discourse ethics becomes a "body of mature work" that both stands independently and can relate to other theories, such as the theory of meaning, the theory of communicative rationality, social theory, and democratic, legal, or political theory (Finlayson).

The dialogic dimension within discourse ethics of inclusion is similar to the act of "narrating" in Ricœur's terms (Okulska). Narrating embodies the praxis of memory, suffering, pardon, and forgiveness, and it replaces past distorted relations with integrity in the future. Narratives are carried by the medium of dialogic civility as the common ground within public communicative space (Arnett and Arneson). From one of the foundational articles for the study of universal-humanitarian communication ethics, Gunson and Collins explore discourse ethics in relation to institutionalized procedures. Forming a rational and emancipated society becomes doable through a strategic process that moves human identities from "the I ... to the we of the

general interest.” (Gunson and Collins). However, that institutionalized procedure has problems, such as distinguishing the idea from the real or measuring the outcomes. Habermasian discourse ethics may offer solutions.

Benhabib extends Habermas’s discourse ethics and critical criticism to encompass Otherness and diversity by comparing the Kantian origins of discourse ethics to the Hegelian critique. She envisions an “ideal community of communication” that has places for feminism and postmodernism (Benhabib 24). She also explores communitarianism, political, and liberal moral critical theories, allowing for intersubjectivity between multiple sociocultural contexts to appear. The difference between Benhabib and Habermas appears in the overall philosophical direction to criticism. Habermas tends to defend modern philosophy, while Benhabib leans on the linguistic game grounding postmodern philosophy. Her understanding of the “concrete other” refers to the cultural and social contextualization of rationality guided by the right to participate in the communicative act. Benhabib’s critical understanding of the Other is also different from Levinas’s, which is phenomenological in nature. Levinas’s communication ethics touches on the I-We framework inspired by Russian literature. Here, “being” in relation to or with the “Other” has some rhetorical obligations (Arnett, *Levinas’s Rhetorical Demand*). For instance, Levinas omits the Kantian categorical imperative and replaces hearing with listening, forming the call for reasonability in communication ethics. From here also emerges the awareness of the particular Other carried by the “derivative I” that is responsible to ethics, audio, the historical moment, and the face of the Other.

Discourse ethics connects linguistics and linguistic philosophy to the philosophical grounds of social theory. It is important for foreign policy, international relations studies, crisis, organizational communication (Deetz), and dialogic communication ethics (Arnett,

*Communication Ethics*). The rhetorical route that Habermas takes to conceptualize discourse ethics by integrating politics and argumentation feeds the notion of dialogic civility, which is important for interpersonal praxis. Discourse ethics also feeds theories of power (Mumby). In specific, Mumby unpacks critical Habermasian theories of power, showing an interplay of Marxism and neo-Marxism on ideology critique. Habermas's "work lies in his efforts to articulate the power-ethics relationship in a manner that directly addresses questions of communicative praxis" (Mumby 87). Hyde sees how discourse ethics and morality "ground" the life-giving gift of acknowledgment in the "rational" and in the linguistic truth of being in the world (*The Life-Giving Gift* 163). Being in the world is about engaging in argumentation where acknowledgment and open-mindedness emerge from the nature of human existence. Habermas does not invest in developing a phenomenological and ontological understanding of "the relationship between the ethos of human being, its call of conscience, and our capacity for acknowledgment ("Ethics" 40). However, he cares about the validity claims underpinning communicative actions, which have a transcendental status.

Communicative rationality is important to "modes of thought and action" in the marketplace (Muller), highlighting relational themes within Habermas's discourse ethics. Relations formed through public discourse, free speech, and democracy depend on a consensus and a rational communicative act. The relational theme in Habermas's philosophy continuously references bourgeois culture (*The Structural Transformation*). It is a theme that appears in *The Theory of Communicative Action* and within *Legitimation Crisis*. This later appears in efforts to clarify the structures of hypotheses beneath the dynamic development of capitalism. "Organized capitalism" is an expression representing advances in accumulation processes (Habermas, *Legitimation* 33), formed by economic concentration. To approach the idea, Habermas applies

social theory to the Marxian theory of crisis in the age of advanced capitalism. He traces crisis that emerged first as a medical term before it was adopted in social science through systems theory. Within classical aesthetic studies, crisis is a turning point represented through a crucial process (*Legitimation 2*). In the category of classical tragedy, crisis entered the social theories of the nineteenth century as a salvation inherited from the philosophy of the eighteenth century. In the systems theory approach, crises happen when there are few possibilities to maintain the well-being of the structure of the social system. Crises, here, are perceived as disturbances to system integration. Social system crises are not accidental but inherited in systems lacking integration with the whole hierarchy. crisis tendencies in advanced capitalism come from various economic, administrative, or legitimation systems levels (*Legitimation 34*). Legitimation systems appear according to the functional weaknesses in the market as a side effect of advancing capitalism. Legitimation, here, responds to two requirements: the “civic privatism” focusing on advancing career and consumption, and the “structural depoliticization” supported with the help of the democratic elite or technocratic systems theories (37).

*Legitimation Crisis* is important for the study of ethics of crisis communication and corporate apologetics theories. Here, corporate apologetics as legitimating discourse emphasizes the ways in which crisis response functions as a means of re-establishing the legitimacy of corporate, organizational, or institutional action. Legitimacy is constituted or dissolved by acts of corporate apologetics and creates conditions for future crises. Legitimation is also important to critical organizational communication (Deetz) and to economic justice and communication ethics (Schaefer et al.). Here, market discourse, neoliberalism, and persuasion align moral and ethical gaps to examine the means of communicative distortion within symbolic dimensions of the human experience (Schaefer et al. 436).

Habermas's idea of distorted communication has been challenged by many critics, and Jean-François Lyotard is one of them. Lyotard starts a discussion that is important to the position of rationality within dialogic communication. In "Legitimation by Paralogy," Lyotard (1984) argues that postmodernity cannot tolerate Habermas's universal consensus through a dialogue of argumentation alone. The idea of collecting consensus does not reflect the ethical. Lyotard says that Habermas's understanding of "humanity as a collective (universal) subject seeks its common emancipation through the regularization of the 'moves' permitted in all language games and that the legitimacy of any statement resides in its contributing to that emancipation" (66). Lyotard aims to explain that consensus as the validation criterion has its own inadequacies, inherited in its dialogic nature, in the use of narratives of emancipation and the presupposition that mutual agreement is always achievable. Consensus claims its validity as an instrument toward achieving legitimacy within the system of power.

Habermas's work is important to IMC and particularly public relations, one of the IMC components. His discourse ethics has been important for symmetrical communication, discourse, mutual understanding, dialogue, and consensus (Buhmann et al.). Pearson (cited in Buhmann et al.) brings an important milestone by applying discourse ethics to public relations. He elaborates on public protest and corporate response. Systematic recognition of Habermas within public relations followed afterwards. Responding to the increasing interests in Habermas, Buhmann et al. present a quantitative study using a bibliometric analysis that observes publications and citation patterns. The three main topics of focus are public sphere, dialogic stakeholder relationships, and communication ethics. The findings show that Habermas is important for the areas of public relations, accountability, legitimacy, transparency, corporate social responsibility

(CSR), reputation, corporate branding, dialogue, and the relationship between public relations and journalism (Buhmann et al.).

### **3.3. Habermas, Foucault, and Cosmopolitanism Theory**

So far, Habermas's discourse ethics acts as an overall umbrella structuring his own version of communication ethics and criticism. Public sphere theory, communicative rationality, and cosmopolitanism theory create the pillars of a discursive analysis, which Habermas uses to strengthen the argumentative and communicative consciousness underpinning discourse ethics. Specifically, cosmopolitanism theory connects the missing dots between Habermas and Foucault, and between Foucault and Said, in setting the meaning of a communicative rational discourse without neglecting the moral discussion. It creates a response to globalization characterized by the hegemony of market economy and democracy. Habermas formulates his cosmopolitanism theory in a way that fits in contemporary modern times but without neglecting the Kantian cosmopolitanism in the background (Fine and Smith). He touches the critique of reason in different books discussing the public sphere and communicative rationality. However, such a criticism appears more focused and highlighted in *The Postnational Constellation*. For Habermas, cosmopolitan democracy has multiple goals. One of them is to create a political order that replaces the power of nation state with democratic membership in "a world parliament" (107). He engages in one way or another with theories of power that bring him closer to Foucault.

Michel Foucault (1926–1984), a social theorist and postmodern philosopher of communication, has a different perspective on the development of discourse analysis and its role in forming social analysis. Foucault is important for discussions of gender blindness, queer theory, the communicology of identity, and discourses of exclusion and religion, mass media,

and power (Benhabib). His works in communication studies appear as constitutive, performative, and critical (Arnett and Holba 229). The core of Lyotard, Foucault, and Derrida's work is the impossibility of isolating oneself from the "language games" represented by social interactions, which exist according to human existence, emphasizing sociocultural understanding (Lyotard 17). Farrell provides a picture of Foucault within the discourse of hegemony and power in which discourse does not exist except in this form. Hauser agrees and compares Foucault with Habermas regarding linguistic permission. Habermas and Foucault agree that power is essential to the understanding of discourse.

When Radford (2005) explores philosophy of communication, he traces communication as a discourse in light of Foucault's historiography of human sciences, which is also attached to theories of power. The main goal within such a discursive approach is to explore the functionality of any area of study to produce knowledge while keeping in mind the role of power behind their distribution. Habermas, on the other hand, does not separate the production of knowledge from communicative rationality. By exploring the enlightenment critique of reason, Habermas pays attention to concealed and "crafty forms of domination" that can be inferred from Kantian universalism and cosmopolitanism (Schmidt 147). The attempts of saving humanity from exile, oppression, racism, and other forms of discrimination are never ultimately innocent ideas. They are always controlled by subject-centered reason. Away from that Nietzschean genealogy of power, Habermas strengthens his own route to discursive rationality and moral discussion. A discourse, for Foucault, is a tool meant to produce knowledge, while for Habermas, discourse is meant to direct the rationality of the communicative enterprise. In other words, the distinction between Foucault and Habermas in how they interpret the Kantian democratic cosmopolitanism becomes an interesting area for IMC to explore.



In *Perpetual Peace*, Immanuel Kant describes that by “cosmopolitan right” he means “no fantastical, high-flown notion of right, but a complement of the unwritten code of law-constitutional as well as international law-necessary for the public rights of mankind in general and thus for the realization of perpetual peace” (142). Habermas explains that this democratic cosmopolitanism, while aiming for political freedom, is bounded by a Kantian understanding of “public use of reason” (*The Postnational Constellation* 110). The pragmatic analysis of argumentation at the center of Habermas’s discourse theory represents this use of reason socially and practically by utilizing communicative competence. Language becomes the medium for assessing communicative action. Habermas believes in the power of discourse, its cognitive qualities, and its ability to reserve universal norms. Goodnight highlights how Habermas comes closer to Arendt’s appreciation of the role of speech in public communication in which communicative competence represents the dimensions of relational and symbolic interaction aided by the use of language.

However, for Foucault, the discursive process leads to discourse as a form of hegemony and power (Farrell). In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (2002), Foucault traces the rules of discursive formation of knowledge and the life cycle of that formation from existence to end. He explains how the discursive formation of knowledge affects the position and nature of discourse. From this system of creating a history of ideas emerges the discussion of power, the truth of the teller, and the power of exclusion. History, for Foucault, is “one way in which a society recognizes and develops a mass of documentation with which it is inexorably linked” (7). Archeological analysis seeks to describe the history of discourse. Here, the rhetoric of exclusion becomes a cultural representation of a regime of linguistic hegemony (Farrell 186). Foucault’s discourse assists the historical understanding of the rupture of episteme. With the power of

discourse in the hand of institutions, capitalism, and disciplinary institutions, finding truth and creating a system of exclusion becomes a matter of communicative competence impacting speaking and writing (Ijsseling).

What Habermas's discourse model lacks is an attentiveness to Otherness, which has been neglected while searching for universal truth and morality. Gerard Delanty presents a critical perspective of Habermas's communicative rationality characterized by Eurocentrism. He starts from the notion of modernity rooted in Occidental rationalism. This understanding of modernity fails to adapt to different global cultural contexts outside the Occidental consciousness. Delanty proposes a cosmopolitan model of cultural transformation that brings culture and identity to the foreground of communicative rationality. What the Foucauldian discursive approach adds to Habermas's discourse, then, is a situatedness in cultural particularity, which Said's *Orientalism* also brings to light.

Said provides a version of universal discourse ethics that is attentive to cultural criticism. He contextualizes the misrepresentation of the Otherness in the idea of "textual attitude," or the textual power that has been shaping the interactions between the Occident and the Other for centuries (Said *Orientalism*). It is a textual reaction emerging from institutionalized meanings according to critical and historical analysis. Texts produce knowledge and reality, while reality and knowledge produce traditions. When combined with the discursive methodology learned from Habermas, Said's cultural criticism presents a case of understanding humanistic communication ethics. It is an understanding that connects power and the representation of power to philosophy of communication ethics and applied communication studies. Between power as an obstacle facing the production and distribution of knowledge and power as democratic form of domination appears the integration of marketing communication activities

across national borders as a morally problematic issue. From within these discussions comes the potential of doing IMC as a discourse, as the first step before understanding the ability of marketing communication to produce humanistic integration.

### **3.4. Conclusion**

Habermas's critical communication ethics and moral philosophy in the background of IMC discourse are both important for discussing the phenomenon of integration. These concepts allow an ethical understanding of integration to emerge in later chapters. Instead of a means of rigid control and unification of branding voices, integration becomes an invitation to utilize communicative rationality on public and social levels. Habermas's examination of early forms of integration in media and communication history points to an old and established moral discussion about the interplay of power, ideology, communication, and interpretation. By bringing public sphere theory, communicative rationality, and cosmopolitanism to the fore, this chapter sets the foundation for presenting an ethical version of integration that extracts dialogical moments from cultural differences. Cosmopolitanism theory, in particular, shows the role of discourse ethics in the critique of universal rules and their legitimacy and morality across cultural borders.

## Chapter 4

### Rethinking Integration

Rethinking integration is an idea that critiques IMC via Edward Said's (2003) critical examination of *Orientalism* "as a discourse." Envisioning an ethical version of integration works based on three main assumptions: First, synergy is missing in the IMC literature when it comes to maximizing the potential of technical integration, which consists of tactical integration and strategic integration. IMC studies are highly dependent on marketplace practices. Because of that, tactical applications of integration, as in the unification of promotional and branding voices, tend to disconnect from the corporate umbrella and strategic-based integration. As a result, the focus on ethical studies in the literature remains a large gap. Second, Habermas's critical communication ethics is philosophically enlightening for integration, but it suffers a cultural bias and Eurocentrism. Habermas navigates communicative potential in the public sphere through different theories and discussion. Yet, Habermas and IMC remain in culturally biased containers. Third, Said's discursive analysis of the role of textual representations in shaping Orient-Occident relations adds a situated cultural reflection that is important for an ethical version of technical integration. Said is not known as an expert in moral philosophy like Habermas—at least not through *Orientalism*. However, his historical and critical analysis of the idea of meeting or representing the Other takes Foucauldian discourse beyond power-controlled production of knowledge. Said presents a humanistic-based boundarylessness that manifests through deliberate and open communicative actions. The question remains: how is an ethical version of integration achievable via Said's *Orientalism* and his lived experience?

At first glance, IMC has nothing to do with *Orientalism* nor with Habermas's discourse ethics. However, by exploring the historical construct that has shaped Western and specifically

American perceptions of the Orient in the Near East/MENA region, market-based connotations come to light. Unlike eighteenth-century orientalism driven by purely political agendas of colonization to explore the distant Other, twentieth-century orientalism attends to marketplace rules. In the eighteenth century, the “Orient existed as a place isolated from the mainstream of European progress in the sciences, arts, and commerce” (*Orientalism* 206). Today, however, globalization and the technological revolution have spread their own versions of commercial and communication.

A one-sided relationship continues to shape Western–non-Western market relations. A sense of cosmopolitan boundarylessness coming from advanced capitalism transports cultural identities, norms, and moral values through media and packaged goods. The best global brands known in the Western world too often engage in circulating offensive, misrepresentative, culturally insensitive, or racist advertising via mediated content. Unlike “latent orientalism,” which characterizes the early colonial movements that produced imaginative representations of the Other, the “manifest orientalism” beginning in the 1970s has produced tangible consequences (*Orientalism*). The manifest version has consistently incorporated views of the imaginative inferior Orient, inherited from latent orientalism, diffused into society, language, literature, history, and sociology. Contemporary branding extends the route used by colonial explorers of the eighteenth century to talk, represent, and write about the Orient Other. Manifest Orientalism and “Orientalism Now” control the production of knowledge in the MENA region, according to a deliberate discourse of institutional power (*Orientalism*). As a result, integration appears in simple forms, packaged, for example, in Western goods, services, and mediated representations of Otherness.

This chapter explores and critiques integration via *Orientalism*. The discussion starts with Said and the way in which he explores Orientalism as an illustration of Foucault's understanding of discourse. What shapes this discourse is the combination of Said's lived experience between distinct cultural consciousnesses, the Foucauldian discursive methodology highlighting the role of power in producing knowledge, and the critical systematic tracking of historical events and facts. The critique of integration via *Orientalism* envisions an ethical version of integration that aligns Habermas's philosophical integration and Said's situated reflection on cultural misrepresentation. Habermas's discourse ethics encompassing public sphere theory, communicative rationality, and democratic cosmopolitanism is short on exploring modernity outside the Occidental consciousness. It has been critiqued for lacking adaptation to different global and cultural contexts beyond the Western world (Delanty). Accordingly, Said's analysis appears to add the potential of the communicative act situated in cultural particularity to Habermasian discourse ethics. Said does not reflect on the potential of Foucauldian discursive systematic writing on ethical discussions (Iskandar and Rustom). *Orientalism* explores the roots of cultural bias by engaging the idea of textual representation. Said illustrates a case of integrated communication that has been systematically produced through the use of market, educational, and political institutional power.

When focusing on ethical discussions in IMC literature, integration appears problematic. The lack of interplay of tactical integration of promotional tools and strategic corporate-wide integration prevents exploration of ethics in IMC. Such confusion delays paying attention to moral discussions. Tactical integration finds promotional power and visual communication sufficient to drive brands toward success. Discussions of automatically promoting materialism, racist content, and the Western individualistic philosophy become the norm. A sense of

cosmopolitan boundarylessness works according to the capitalistic rules of maximizing financial values. International opportunities for business outside local markets erased many social and cultural obligations, and the advertising industry is just one example of that erasure (Fu). Different global brands take the lead in introducing non-local concepts, images, or interpretations of happiness with lack of attention to their connotations in hosting cultures. Schultz et al. (*The Evolution*) invested scholarly efforts in conceptualizing their concerns about the cultural bias that grounds IMC theory. Integration is consensus management through the act of bringing things together on different cultural, economic, and political levels. From neglecting cultural considerations comes the question about the speed and rationality of applying integration across different cultural settings. The literature of IMC ethics spots problems including racism, misrepresentation of minorities, and offensive advertising (Kliatchko) that contradict the essence of communication ethics and economic justice (Schaefer et al., *The Evolution*). In this context, capitalistic institutions illustrate a colonization of the lifeworld, the moral roots of which Habermas grounds in communicative acts.

After exploring Said's discourse power and Habermas's discourse ethics, IMC discourse can centralize ethically and culturally relevant attributes. IMC becomes a discourse that has Habermas's communicative rationality (or discourse ethics) in the background. Such a discourse also hopes that a process of dialogic learning points to the concerns of the Other and expands the discussion of universal-humanitarian communication ethics. Rethinking integration aligns Schultz et al.'s (*The Evolution*) conceptualization of IMC as tactical (communicative consistency), strategic (consensus management strategy), and culturally biased with Said's conceptualization of *Orientalism*, without neglecting Habermas's discourse ethics in the background. Inspired by Said, rethinking integration envisions an ethical approach to IMC that

values the role of humanistic and deliberate boundarylessness in putting appearances of race, color, and ethnicity aside while interacting with the Other.

#### **4.1. Integrated Orientalization**

Edward Said (1935–2004) was a literary and cultural critic. He was a Princeton graduate and Professor of Comparative Literature at Columbia University. He studied culture, colonialism, humanism, exile, West-East relationships, and the representation of Islam, Arabs, and Palestinians in different publications. Said lived in different Arabic countries until he settled in New York. As a response to exile, he drew upon the roles of emancipation and corporate power in shaping intercultural communication. He also fed the language of emancipation diffused to marketing. This lived reality is apparent in his observations of the production-consumption framework that has controlled Orient-Occident relationships. In his book *Orientalism* (2003), Said unpacks the Western production of visual representations in eighteenth-century orientalist novels about Arabs. He also examines the photographs of Palestinians in Western media (*Covering Islam*). He pays attention to the visual representations of reality based on examining “historico-theoretical space” (Hussein). Said relies on the potential within discursive formation guided by the interplay of phenomenological hermeneutics, Marxism, poststructuralism, philology, and anti-imperialist discourse.

Said is known as a postcolonial and traveling theorist among Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Homi K. Bhabha (Massad, “The Intellectual Life”). These theorists all infuse “epistemic purpose and discursive coherence into postcolonial studies” (Iskandar and Rustom). Both Said and Spivak tackle issues of representation and speech acts within hegemonic discourse structures. Spivak describes Said as “technically an Arab American, but it is difficult to think of him as American. But it seems completely appropriate to think of him as a New Yorker”



(Iskandar and Rustom 54). Said lived between Palestine in his early childhood, Egypt as an elementary-school student, and New York for the rest of his life. His cultural experiences shaped his consciousness of belonging to in-betweenness (*Out of Place*). He interacted with the idea of colonialism and the “colonizer” from an early age, for example, when the Palestinians were expelled in 1948 (Iskandar and Rustom 4) and during his elementary education in Cairo. It was a time when Western educational systems sustained Eastern colonies in Egypt, Syria, and Algeria (Iskandar and Rustom 4). Said grew up in between cultures. Exile and emancipation created a relation of cause and effect that shaped his “pedagogy of nomadism,” inspired by Foucault and rooted in the Hegelian dialectic (Iskandar and Rustom 7).

Said’s “traveling theory” described in *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (1984) is an illustration of the notion of the pedagogy of nomadism. Cultures, disciplines, and intellectual efforts never originate from one specific place. Rather, they attend to the dynamic of circulation and the laws of movement that transfer ideas from one place to another. Accordingly, ideas automatically attend to the “process of representation and institutionalization,” which does not necessarily comply with their original forms or essence (*The World* 226). Ideas, here, pass through four stages of movements: the birthplace, the passage, the stage of acceptance or resistance, and finally, the fully transformed idea. After their initial emergence, ideas are “transversed” through different times and places. Here, pressure accompanies the process of transmission. Some ideas may appear more tolerable or acceptable than others. Cultural bias is just one factor among many that contribute to the acceptance and resistance stage. IMC literature relates to this point. Years later, Schultz et al. (*The Evolution*) ask this question about the validity of IMC as a culturally biased theory outside Western origins and to what extent applicability to other contexts is possible. This discussion is present in Section 2.1.3.

Said's scholarship is historically rooted in Giambattista Vico's (1668–1744) Italian rhetoric and humanism. He uses concepts from Vico as a secondary model to support his discursive analysis in *Orientalism* (2003). Vico is important to Said because he liberates humanity from rigid academic systems that limit creativity and freedom (Iskandar and Rustom). In his books *On the Study Method of Our Time* (1708) and *New Science* (1725), Vico provides a constructive rhetoric against the Cartesian supremacy of reason over imagination. Even math is a symbolic act and transcendental. Practicing imperfection and listening to cultural particularities are forms of manifesting humanism for Vico. Something like common sense and *phronesis* come from an alignment with human customs that are embedded in socially shared beliefs. Common sense develops from metaphorical language that is constitutive of memory, judgment, reason, and imagination. *Phronesis* aids the process of creative decision-making, poetic wisdom, poetic metaphysics, poetic logic, and morality.

Said's critical thinking connects to this rhetorical understanding of the role of intellectual practice (*Zreik*). His professional training in philology and literary criticism is rooted in Vico's poetic logic and Auerbach's rhetoric of humanity. The intellectual act performs criticism through questioning, searching, and interrogating the inner meanings behind modes of culture, hegemony, power, and identity. It is a criticism that manifests when it deconstructs totality or totalitarianism. The ethics of the intellectual act, for Said, emerges from this critical labor. Said's exposure to criticism from within different traditions and philosophical schools allows him to balance between the rhetorical language of humanistic emancipation and the critical techniques of the pragmatism of exile (Kennedy 11). Said's biography and uprooted lived experience inspired many scholars, cultural critics, activists, and human rights advocates. For example, Iskandar and Rustom edited collections of essays inspired by Said's legacy of emancipation and

representation. Valerie Kennedy (2000) devoted a whole critical study to Said's *Orientalism*, imperialism, and postcolonialism. Ashcroft and Ahluwalia and Ashcroft and Kadhim focused more on Said's literary criticism and cultural imperialism from perspectives of postcolonial studies.

Said is among Spivak and Bhabha, who expand the epistemic and discursive structures underpinning postcolonial studies. Yet, Said's postcolonialism painted with exile and in-betweenness shapes his intellectual horizon, which constantly looks for literary enlightenment and "refuge for emancipatory action" (Iskandar and Rustom 5). Beyond *Orientalism*, Said's writings influenced a humanist method and "worldly" ideas used later in media literacy, the tension between vernaculars and ideologies, and the politics and aesthetics of cultures and society (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia). The waves of emancipation and social liberation that sustained American public discourse and pedagogy before and during the 1970s are reflected in Said's early writing, especially *Orientalism*. Said states that there has been "a revolution in the consciousness of women, minorities and marginals so powerful as to affect mainstream thinking world-wide" (Kennedy 350). Elements of structuralism, Marxism, and feminism were introduced to Anglo-American pedagogy (Kennedy).

This is also true on the personal level. Kennedy (2000) explains how Said's eagerness to write *Orientalism* came from "his initial sense of alienation," feeling half American and half Arab. He brought his divided consciousness into literary reflection inspired by the political events of that time. *Orientalism* moved Said "from being a traditional humanist academic to becoming one of the most significant Anglophone cultural and political commentators of the later twentieth century contents" (Kennedy 5). From there, Said aligned himself to the Jewish exile that comes from the "recognition of suffering and dehumanization" (Iskandar and Rustom

11). Gradually, he dropped disciplinary labels and sympathized with anti-Semitism and the Judaic exile through secular criticism. Secular criticism became his widely heard refusal of nationalism, theological beginnings, and “infallible gods” (Massad, “Affiliating” 34).

#### **4.1.1. The Text**

*Orientalism* was first published in 1978 and then in 1995. It is the most influential and widely read book in his trilogy, besides *Covering Islam* (1997) and *Culture and Imperialism* (1993). The three books discuss from different critical perspectives the historical, textual, political, and mediated relationships between the West and the Near East. In specific, *Orientalism* theory was foundational for postcolonial studies and became important for communication studies (Littlejohn and Foss). It has been utilized within media studies (Echchaibi), critical discourse analysis (Bourenane; Bryce), intercultural communication (Mao), and journalism (Rodgers; Vultee). It also offers rich perspectives to the studies of literary criticism (Hussein); linguistics, colonialism, and anthropology (Dirks); and “travel writing” (Kennedy). The book has been translated in over thirty languages around the world, including Arabic by Mohamed Enani and others. *Orientalism* offers a multiplicity of readings depending on different scholarly interests.

Said highlighted in different interviews that *Orientalism* was a project inspired by the 1973 Arab Israeli War and his professional interests in Arabic language and philology a year before while visiting Lebanon (Hafez). The time during and after the 1970s has been marked by international political conflicts. There arose continuous Arab Israeli conflicts, on one side, and the Arab American oil crises, on the other. Interestingly enough, such conflicted times did not stop Arabic dependency on the American market, nor did it stop Americans from importing unrefined crude oil from the Gulf countries. Said explains:

The Arab and Islamic world as a whole is hooked into the Western market system. No one needs to be reminded that oil, the region's greatest resource, has been totally absorbed into the United States economy. By that I mean not only that the great oil companies are controlled by the American economic system; I mean also that Arab oil revenues, to say nothing of marketing, research, and industry management, are based in the United States. This has effectively made the oil-rich Arabs into huge customers of American exports: this is as true of states in the Persian Gulf as it is of Libya, Iraq, and Algeria—radical states all. My point is that the relationship is a one-sided one, with the United States a selective customer of a very few products (oil and cheap manpower, mainly), the Arabs highly diversified consumers of a vast range of United States products, material and ideological. (*Orientalism* 324)

Since the 1970s, American-Arab relations have reflected imperialism and cultural domination mediated by the marketplace responding to political tension.

Throughout continuous systematic and historical efforts, the Arabic identity in mediated content has become contained within man-made visuals showing backwardness, racial degradation, and irrationality (*Orientalism*). Massad (“Affiliating”) and Ashcroft both explain in different terms how late modern representations of Otherness were initiated after heavy dependence on oil trading. Prasad and Mir’s understanding of Said’s *Orientalism* as “taken-for-granted beliefs and feelings” reflects how the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) was framed as responsible for the US economic crises at that time. Prasad and Mir utilize the critical hermeneutics of Habermas and others to explore the socio-political and historical dimensions around the manipulations of meaning that happened during that time. They analyze corporate and business communication between CEOs to explore humanistic and

ideological interests in guiding the communicative process. A letter from Amoco's CEO in 1978, states, "Continuing heavy reliance on Middle Eastern oil is extremely dangerous to the security of the United States and its allies in the industrialized Western world" (103). Prasad and Mir unpack from this text implicit and contradicted images of OPEC such as powerful corporate body, dangerous, and vulnerable communism. These scholars see an actualization of Said's discursive analysis that visualizes deficiencies on the Other's cultural or moral structure.

The historical context around writing *Orientalism* is not far from the theoretical emergence of IMC studies. By the early 1980s, communication strategies focused more on the power of sales, media advertising, and publicity, responding to the major influence of globalization (Schultz and Schultz). Globalization, transformation, emancipation, and social change sustained advertising and consumption (Ewen). Schaefer et al.'s ("Economic Justice") study on the ethics of economic justice aligns those topics. Today, big brands automatically respond to social movements again market growth within globalization discourse, utilizing their communicative efforts accordingly. The Internet revolution of the 1990s and the attack of the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, both justified free-trade market policies for the sake of reaching global stability. The ideas of economic correctness and searching for happiness increased after colonization and late capitalism. The rationalization of the economic sphere became an organizational responsibility to challenge social disruption and loss of morals. From there, a series of continuous efforts to integrate marketing and corporate efforts followed.

Yet, problems like advertising as the "sphere of ideology" and representations of "racial identity" and the "racial other" have not disappeared but have been receiving more mediated volume within globalization (Fu, page number). Responding to integrated communication efforts in the marketplace, *Orientalism* offers a manual of man-made production of "learned judgement"

that justifies a one-sided version of truth (67). It shows an illustration of an integrated production-consumption framework that manages perception and public consensus (Iskandar and Rustom). It also presents a “radical” approach and textual construction coming from the will to power, responding to materialistic, political, and economic domination (Kennedy). *Orientalism* initiates a legacy of unpacking the historical and textual roots of Occidental representation of the Oriental Other.

#### **4.1.2. The “As a Discourse” Methodology**

Said says that *Orientalism* is always materialized and never an innocent idea (23). It is a form of communicative exchange between individual authors, political concerns shaped by British, French, or American visions, and the constituted Orient. When it comes to the methodology, Said explains,

My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage—and even produce—the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period.  
(*Orientalism* 3)

Said explains that the phrase “as a discourse” refers to the discursive formation that Foucault started in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (2002) and *Discipline and Punish* (1975). The Foucauldian discourse, here, refers to “the accommodations of singular events to repeating epistemological structures” (Said, *The World* 119). It is the set of discursive practices that create limitations between facts and object, legitimize specific perspectives and norms, and elaborate certain theories of beliefs (Foucault, *The Archaeology*). According to Kennedy, “Foucault’s concepts of discourse and of discursive formations, his discussions of the relationships between

power and knowledge, and his view that representations are always influenced by the systems of power in which they are located” (25). Within modern *Orientalism*, Said uses chronological descriptions found in the works of artists, scholars, and poets to uncover the Orient based on his/her position in Western consciousness and imaginative geography. Said departs from Gramsci’s idea that cultures operate in a civil society, in which schools, homes, and families all drive consent over domination in establishing communicative links between people, ideas, and institutions (*Orientalism*).

Commentators on Said see how his explanation of discourse analysis transforms Foucault’s postmodern philosophy into an ontological and epistemological “style of thought” (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia). He brings a systematic and critical interpretive approach to unpack the maneuverability of cultures, their attitudes of domination, resistance, and contradiction. Said emphasizes that examining something as an independent object is different from examining the circulated discourse around that object. That style of discursive criticism illustrates itself in the history of Western colonization of the Near East and India as well as in visual representations of Islam in Western media (Said, *Covering Islam*). It is a discursive criticism important to the portrayal of the consumer and the representation of Otherness that IMC studies need.

Foucauldian discourse emerges from theories of power situated in the appearance of episteme, such as time, geography, politics, society, and their influences on generating and producing knowledge. Archaeologies in this context are discourses and “interrelated sets of statements that serve to convey, embody, and reinforce a range of valid claims about what is true and knowable by a given group of people at a given time” (Carr 39). These discourses connect power and knowledge, analysis and action, in a Hegelian dialectic yet problematic manner. They feed Said’s “pedagogy of nomadism,” which shows exile and nationalism in constant tension



(Iskandar and Rustom). Kennedy explains that Foucault's works "expose the dangers and modes of operation of totalitarianism and of oppressive systems of thought and institutions, but they do not contribute to the destruction of totalitarianism or injustice in practice" (25). Foucault does not necessarily suggest that analysis should lead to action and change, which is reflected in Said's writing in formulating the role of the intellectual in shaping humanity. Said believes, like Gramsci (a thinker used in *Orientalism*), that theory and practice should work in parallel.

The discursive approach helps to unpack the means of power and hegemony in geopolitical and marketplace activities. It can be power political (like modern policy), power intellectual (such as science or comparative language), or power cultural (orthodoxies of taste, text, values, or power moral that controls the ought) (Said *Orientalism*). Said's understanding of the power of Foucauldian discourse resonates to hegemonic "accommodations of singular events to repeating epistemological structures" (*The World* 119). The relationships between the Orient and England, France, and the US grew out of a systematic production of knowledge colonized by political power and mediated misrepresentation. After the Napoleonic expedition, the Orient was discovered scientifically. By the turn of the eighteenth century, linguistic Orientalism emerged underpinning the systematic and institutional circulation of geopolitical realism mixed with fantasy about the distant Other. Those materials were widely produced in "aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological historical, and philological texts" (Said, *Orientalism* 12). The Orient became an entity behind the ontological and epistemological production of the Occident. From these institutional discourses emerged the discussion of misrepresentation and stereotyping about Arabs (Fu; Kennedy).

Discourse uncovers the imbalance between continuous Western efforts to understand the Orient since eighteenth-century colonial studies and the quantity of Arab organizations that

critically study Western culture. Said sees nonequivalent efforts in knowing or unknowing the Other. The Arab world is “hooked” through consumerism of Western capitalism (Said, *Orientalism* 324). Since the mid-twentieth century, power derives from consuming, trading, and negotiating over oil, which controls the world’s economy, Arab countries included. Oil revenues saturate the American economy, in marketing and mass media production as well as in research, development, and growth (*Orientalism*). Orientalism as a discourse becomes a body of theory and practice and a sign of Western power fabricated in socio-economic and political institutions. It is not a myth, a fantasy, nor an absolute truth.

*Orientalism* has been critiqued for lacking a solid explanation of its methodology. For example, Kennedy argues, “What is lacking, interestingly, is any reference to Foucault’s ideas of the archive or a discourse or systems of disciplinary control” (9). Said is aware of the Foucauldian complexity of the discursive approach due to the interplay of notions like representation, power, and knowledge. Kennedy explains that complexity comes from the interplay of theory and action within those key concepts. It is also due to the highly subjective nature of defining those terms and defining power in particular. As a result, a sense of inconsistency in Said’s implementation of Foucault’s discourse appears to surface.

Discursive formation is an alternative route to the production of knowledge attending to the lived circumstances and dynamic of power. It has a descriptive style of archiving searches for episteme within specific times, locations, politics, or social specifications. Usually, within the archiving history of ideas appears discussions of power, the truth of the teller, and exclusion. Discursive formation is designed according to continuous chains of epistemological structures, which ground recurrent patterns in genealogical histories of the beginnings, or the Aristotelian laws of logic behind the symbolic roles in constituting cultures. In other words, the linguistic

nature of texts embeds an interplay of time that creates the “archival fact,” in which the archive creates a social discursive presence (Said, *The World* 51). Said sees the role of text in forming the past and the role of criticism in powering the present. It is from within the improper balance between power and knowledge in the social sphere that emerges the formation of the subject, the self, and the Other. The power of discourse in the hand of institutions, capitalism, and disciplinary institutions (such as correction facilities) creates a system of exclusion and will-to-truth, impacting speech and writing (Ijsseling). The takeaway from the Foucauldian discursive approach emphasizes the fine line between a humanistic horizon of emancipation and the will to dominate, which allows a new perspective of dealing with the Other to emerge (Said, *Orientalism* 2003).

Said gives further explanation of the discursive formation during his interview with *Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism*. The general theme of the interview highlights literary criticism, Foucault’s discourse, and intellectual responsibility. Said departs again from the idea of combining theory with the “realm of worldly concerns of power domination and representation” (Kennedy 10). He explains that his focus on the marriage of discursive formation and the uniqueness of archival textuality unpacks important meanings about the construction of power. What makes *Orientalism* a form of knowledge and an intellectual achievement is the systematic writing “in the world and directly about the world” (Said, “Interview” 41). A text, Said says, can never be a mere text. A text is a situatedness, placement, and materialization of discourse—*Orientalism*, in this case.

Another critique of *Orientalism* and its methodology comes from the highly abstractive Foucauldian nature of the discursive formation itself. Said says that the power of exchange between two entities produces three categorizations or dimensions of power: power political (like

modern policy), power intellectual (such as science or comparative language), and power cultural (orthodoxies of taste, text, values, or power moral that control the “ought”). As a result, there is a multiplicity of Orientalism, the European French and German, the British, and the American (Said, *Orientalism* 23). The commonality between the German and the British lies in the intellectual hegemony that justified controlling the Oriental Other. It becomes challenging to assess the multiplicity of Orientalism due to the various extracted representations embedded in the original language, culture, institutions, and political sphere of their producers (Kennedy).

For Said, Foucault’s discursive formation is interpreted differently in other disciplines. For instance, in linguistics, Norman Fairclough compares Foucault’s discourse analysis to “textually oriented discourse analysis” (TODA). He explains that “one cannot simply ‘apply’ Foucault’s work in discourse analysis; it is a ... matter of ‘putting Foucault’s perspective to work’ ... within TODA and trying to operationalize his insights in actual methods of analysis” (Fairclough 38). Foucault developed this discourse methodology to engage with humans. He wanted a discourse approach beyond structuralism and hermeneutics to examine specific sorts of discourses, such as medicine, psychiatry, economics, and grammar. TODA, on the other hand, is concerned with discourse in the general meaning of the term, like in conversations, classroom debates, and media discourse (Fairclough). Foucault’s discourse chases the conditions of possibilities utilizing rules of formation that define an object from a subject, concept, or strategy. Fairclough uses the phrase “domains of knowledge,” central to Foucault’s discourse. The domain, here, has specific rules to follow. These are not prescribed verbatim in written or spoken languages.

The confusion around Foucault’s discourse is inferred when comparing his early and late writings. Early Foucault focuses on what constitutes knowledge. Later, he narrows the inquiry

about knowledge to the role of power within that. He connects the knowledge/power inquiry to the sociohistorical and ethical principles grounding individual acts. This distinction affects Said, as well. Said's late writings realize Foucault's failure to associate the discursive formation to realistic political and social issues (Kennedy). Here appears Said's contribution when he contextualizes stereotyping and misrepresentation of the Other within a "textual attitude." It is a textual reaction emerging from institutionalized meanings according to critical and historical analysis. Texts produce knowledge and reality, and reality and knowledge produce tradition. Foucault's notion of discourse suggests that its materialistic significance stands behind the formation of texts (Kennedy 27).

In reality, Said's ambitious goals of liberating Oriental Otherness from prejudice and misrepresentation have not been met by equally satisfying outcomes. His vision appears when he says,

I feel myself to be clearing the library of such possessing languages of Orientalism, making it possible for myself as an Oriental, and for other Orientals, to speak, using whatever language we feel we need to use. In short, I am writing a work that could be read in either English or Arabic. ("Interview" 44)

Yet, after publishing *Orientalism*, his continuous efforts to explore imperialism and colonialism crystalize in *Culture and Imperialism* (2003). Imperialism, as Said puts it, refers to "the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory," while colonialism is the application and consequence of imperialism (*Culture and Imperialism* 57). Kennedy explains that this form of imperial domination touches cultural, economic, political, and military dimensions (18). Colonialism, on the other hand, comes as an extension of the dominating discourse that appears in travel and exploration, scientific efforts, and humanitarian

causes. Imperialism comes before colonialism, supported by commercial and trading activities as well as by textual attitudes about the Other. The ramifications and consequences of circulating such a textual attitude and imperial rhetoric about the Other for centuries is what influences the cultural and humanistic criticism that Said pursued.

Throughout his biography and intellectual contributions, Said explores directly and indirectly the idea of cultural boundaries. This idea appears in scholarly feedback on the cultural criticism Said presents in *Orientalism* and in the systematic development of postcolonial studies afterwards (Kennedy). The discussion on boundaries and boundarylessness justifies Said's importance to IMC and ethical integration. When culture, boundaries, and globalization intersect within marketplace operations, the ethical question about respecting difference and diversity emerges. The whole idea of decolonizing communicative relations shows its importance to economic justice and humanity (Munshi et al.). Speaking about cultural boundaries contextualizes the diverse understandings of universal morality that is not necessarily transferable. "Deliberate boundarylessness," a notion inspired by Said, is an invitation to a humanistic approach to integration in which attentiveness to cultural differences and Otherness is freed from pre-set judgment and prejudice. This section highlights Said's deliberate boundarylessness, an idea that manifests in his postcolonial communication. It is an invitation to prejudice-free intercultural communication, which must be considered before rethinking a humanistic version of integration.

Said's work, alongside that of other postcolonial scholars, is known for spotting the "rise of cosmopolitanism" and the means of embedded boundarylessness within that (Beck, *Cosmopolitan Vision* 69). Ulrich Beck, a scholar in sociological philosophy, says that cosmopolitanization is like individualization in that it is not a choice but a fate (*Cosmopolitan*

*Vision*). It can shape its own version of reality. What Said sees in the universal humanism resembles Beck's cosmopolitan vision when he says that cosmopolitan life, body, and existence become embedded in another foreign world, religion, or culture (Beck19). The Saidian resistance to labeling appears when he challenges postcolonialism as a classified discipline, despite his great efforts behind its emergence and development (Iskandar and Rustom). Instead, the humanist methodology appearing throughout Said's writings highlights his "worldly" intellectual approach (Iskandar and Rustom 3). He prefers a "coziness of specialization" through a humanistic and worldly approach (Iskandar and Rustom 9). In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said says, "The job facing the cultural intellectual is therefore not to accept the politics of identity as given, but to show how all representations are constructed, for what purpose, by whom, and with what components" (607). Said invites cultural critics to interrogate the "politics of identity," a term that he uses to refer to man-made representations of Otherness. The politics of identity becomes an interesting notion for advertising studies to explore later (Fu).

From its name, postcolonial studies reassure the connotations of Western colonial domination over the rest of the world. Even if such a political domination has historically ended, capitalistic forms of imperialism still extend the idea (Dutta). Postcolonialism is a controversial area of study because it "examines closely the processes and artifacts that produce colonialism, the problematics and contexts of colonialism, and the processes of transformation in the decolonizing project" (Dutta 377). Postcolonialism and the rise of cosmopolitanism together charge the sense of self-awareness among minorities and marginalized groups (Beck, *Cosmopolitan Vision*). They create an immunization against the power of culture and difference, which was once a critical subject of study for colonial scholars.

Still, culture is a form of boundary. Homi K. Bhabha (1994), a scholar who engages with Said's writings, says that

borderline engagements of cultural difference may as often be consensual as conflictual; they may confound our definitions of tradition and modernity; realign the customary boundaries between the private and the public, high and low; and challenge normative expectations of development and progress. (2)

For Bhabha, cultural difference connects to discussions of colonialism and postcolonialism with related discussions of modernity and postmodernity, private and public spheres, and the different abstract understandings of culture within. Cultural absorption becomes a struggle toward an enunciation of independent cultural identification. For instance, postmodernity characterizes cultural differences through their computer-based connectivity within the virtual world, where the space needed for citizenship and pluralism to shape lifestyle and particularity is limited (Erdoğan and Torun). Accordingly, postmodernism as individualism increases the importance of offline communication strategies that can catch the fast pace of postmodern branding. The mission for IMC, then, is not to challenge imperialistic globalization but to know and implement postcolonial communication to support IMC and humanistic integration.

Different scholarly orientations have emerged from Said's postcolonialism, some of which feed advertising discourse and public relations. When it comes to postcolonial communication, both Dutta and Fu draw important connections to public relations and advertising studies. In the postcolonial critique of public relations, Dutta says, "A postcolonial critique of public relations attends to the interplays of culture and power in processes of communication within the realm of geopolitics, unequal power relationships, and colonial relationships of exploitation and oppression" (377). Dutta focuses on the interplay of culture and



power within the context of capitalism and the global market. Understanding globalization as a key influencer behind the emergence of IMC is one form of representing contemporary postcolonialism. Here, notions like inequality, discrimination, and misrepresentation take their contemporary forms. Globalization promotes new types of colonial and intercultural relationships aided by the abundance of technology and information. Public relations tools, like press releases and mediated interaction with the public, justify the spread and continuation of colonial misrepresentation. Dutta suggests “communicative inversions” as a transformation tool to tackle historically man-made symbolic representation (380). The purpose of communication inversions is to suggest counter representations away from the ones circulated by colonial political power, intellectual power, and cultural power.

On the other hand, advertising discourse is a great illustration of man-made constructed representations that are connected to colonization history. In *Advertising and Race* (2014), Fu explores the representation and portrayal of ethnic and racial differences in national and international advertisements over the course of three centuries. She focuses on how the facial, bodily, and cultural identities of the “racial Other” had been utilized to support Western capitalistic perspectives. She quotes an advertising executive who says that the “advertising industry did not create discrimination, but it is one of the most powerful institutions for continuing it” (8). Fu explores topics like the emergence of “white supremacy” in Western advertising discourse and post-World War II racial politics and advertising, which highlights the struggle that resisted inequality and colonization.

Fu brings Said’s “politics of identity” closer to advertising studies (Fu 2). Here, accumulative branding and advertising efforts stand behind the structure of cultures and create one factor in the construction of racial Otherness. Said explains that “what gave the Oriental’s

world its intelligibility and identity was not the result of his own efforts but rather the whole complex series of knowledgeable manipulations by which the Orient was identified by the West” (*Orientalism* 40). By the 1940s, terms like “underdeveloped,” “third world,” and “racist” started to replace the colonial understanding of the “uncivilized” (Fu). Yet, these terms still dwell in the horizon of racial discourses labeling the Other.

Race is one form of nonverbal communication alongside age, nationality, and body (Dyer). Race is generated from stereotypes, humor, and misrepresentative perceptions of the Other. In the early twentieth century, Balfour described Egyptians as sometimes irrational and other times childlike and divergent from the virtuous and “normal” Europeans (Said, *Orientalism*). Said responds that, away from any labels, “the Oriental lived in a different but thoroughly organized world of his own, a world with its own national, cultural, and epistemological boundaries” (*Orientalism* 40). Said prioritizes natural and “cultural strength” that separates between ideas based on militarily, scientific, and aesthetic explorations.

Fu’s examination of racial advertising discourse is highly connected to how postcolonial studies view the emergence and development of “global commodity culture” (118). Globalization, here, is an extension of the different forms of Western domination and imperialism. It is associated with the spread of capitalism and the culture of production and consumption. Amidst all of that, tracking cultural identities becomes a challenge and a commodity to maintain colonial relations. Phenomena like “Americanization,” “McDonaldization,” and “Coca-Colonization” fuel an engine that blurs national and local boundaries in favor of capitalistic development (Fu 119). Fu’s study feeds the gap in IMC studies about technical integration that promotes humanistic assertions while preserving “moral

muteness” about the racial portrayal of Otherness and the commodification of cultural identities (Kliatchko).

Within IMC scholarship, few scholars realize the role of being attentive to national differences that create solid cultural boundaries (Kitchen et al., “Integrated”). Such ethics-based discussions are noticed to disappear from scholarly attention between 1981 and 2005 (Nill and Schibrowsky). Part of this disappearance is due to “moral myopia” and distorted moral views underpinning the rationalizations behind any practical problem in hand (Kliatchko). A limited number of studies tackle the issue by attending to the systematic digital disruption in the global communication system (Cornelissen; Firat et al.; Groom, “Integrated Marketing”; Kitchen and Uzunoglu; Kliatchko; Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). Others focus on the challenges facing advertising practitioners outside their local agencies (Gould) or the role of culture in IMC education (Kerr). Scholars respond both directly and indirectly to the critique of modernity and the role of postmodern theories within that. Retailing, distribution, and technology in the communication revolution have redefined modern market power in which the marketing reality changed accordingly (Kitchen, *The Future*). Firat and Venkatesh discuss how the nature of production and consumption in modern philosophy affects market elements, products, consumers, and media. These scholars utilize Habermas’s critique of modernity to find a place for consumer primacy within consumerism. Here, fragmentation shows how “market elements are separate and unique from products that are separate from customers who are also separate from media” (Schultz et al., *The Evolution* 9).

It is no surprise that IMC literature struggles with culture-related discussions, either neglecting them or including them within other areas of study such as organizational culture or corporate culture. Discussions of culture appear more popular within quantitative (Porcu et al.)

and qualitative organizational culture (Cheney et al., *Organizational Communication*), corporate culture (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Van Riel and Fombrun), and postmodern IMC (Christensen et al., “Integrated”). Especially within quantitative IMC studies, the “contextual factor” characterizing the term “culture” delegates exploration of the term to organizational contexts (Šerić). Totality becomes the synonym of integration within organization (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*). For example, the term “cultural templates” refers to purely organization-based knowledge that IMC practitioners accumulate while exploring social discourses within a specific organization involving common values, historical backgrounds, and cultural specifications (Ots and Nyilasy). Corporate culture “shapes an organization’s business practices, as well as the kinds of relationships that its managers establish with key stakeholders” (Van Riel and Fombrun 57). It has a technical connotation by being a managerial add-on within organizations when compared to culture within Schultz’s et al. content-based framework (*The Evolution*). Corporate culture deals with demonstrations of organizational discourses that are important for coherent integration.

In other words, Christensen et al. find that within the “notion of organizational culture, integrated communications has been extended to include the informal dimensions of the organization, albeit in a formalized version” (*Corporate Communications* 43). Through circulating aligned symbols, images, fictional, and non-fictional narratives, global organizations can establish their solid public presence. Lee notices a “steady” development in culture and advertising studies, but it is still limited in scope, especially in the Middle East and Africa. It lacks the “how to,” especially within GIMC and advertising agencies (Gould; Kitchen et al., “Integrated”).

Efforts to overcome this shortage of cultural discussions vary in scope and focus. Greg Leichty explores public relations discourse in light of Mary Douglas's cultural theory. In this context, Douglas views culture as an ongoing dialogue about the way of life in which cultural bias becomes a cognitive worldview that structures and justifies social relations. As a result, a cultural alliance shifts and twists over time, which also affects public relations practices. Gould, Grein and Gould, and Gould et al. focus on global branding and the struggle of advertising managers in creating culturally relevant campaigns. There is a gap in exploring cultures as sites of meaning making within international advertising agencies. They find it challenging to balance between "vertical" and "horizontal" lines when it comes to planning and implementing global campaigns. Vertical lines refer to the promotional mix, while horizontal lines refer to corporate or national culture that becomes compromised, maintained, or neglected. From here, irrelevant advertising, offensive messages, and misrepresentative images of the Other appear from the shortage of extracting and understanding local meanings (Gould). IMC in general and integration in particular face a managerial issue that complicates implementing unified intercultural strategies while maintaining cultural relevancy to the human consumer (Kitchen and De Pelsmacker). Sometimes campaigns can be obliged by legal or representational rules, while in most cases cultural relevancy is a matter of personal/corporate responsibility to Otherness.

Different dimensions of boundarylessness lead to asking the ethical questions: How is it possible to track a unified code of ethical conduct while implementing global IMC programs? How can decolonizing communication and market relations take an ethical stance? Decolonizing communication ethics becomes an important notion for economic justice and humanity (Munshi et al.). Ethical questions should be taken into account when reconsidering notions within Western Enlightenment, such as the definition of rationality or universal morality, which are not

necessarily transferable. A criticism of ideological, intellectual, and Western imperialism challenges moral muteness and the failure to see moral dimensions because of distorted personal or cultural biases. Deliberate boundarylessness is an invitation to a humanistic version of integration in which attentiveness to cultural differences and Otherness is freed from pre-set judgment and prejudice.

#### **4.2. Rethinking Integration**

The critique of integration via *Orientalism* is an invitation to knowing the Other before claiming the authority on their public presentation. Rethinking integration attaches an ethical perspective to IMC literature inherited from communication ethics. “Imaginatio Creatrix” at the center of communication ethics indicates the human ability to “reinterpret or reorganize” the world in parallel with a sense of freedom (Arneson, *Communicative Engagement* 43). However, this process of self-formation as an art expressed through applying freedom to the proper situation should not neglect the dimensions of an “ethical consciousness” built through previous actions (Arneson, *Communicative Engagement* 77, 79). When Said says that “[l]abels like Indian, or woman, or Muslim, or American are not more than starting-points” and that “[n]o one today is purely one thing,” he insists on highlighting a sense of humanistic, intellectual, and deliberate boundarylessness (*Culture and Imperialism* 647). The question remains, how is that workable within IMC, a highly practical and corporate-based field?

The practicality of integration comes from two different but interdependent levels: tactical and strategic. While both levels define the core of IMC theory itself (Kerr and Kelly), a technical distinction between the two levels appears in practice. Tactical integration can also be called message integration or executional integration (Kerr and Patti). In an early study, Petrison and Wang explain that tactical integration unifies benefits, tones, narratives, logos, and different

executional components across all communicative outlets with consumers. Tactical integration is the unified and consistent style of designing, situating, and delivering public messages with which early IMC and marketing practitioners are familiar (Eagle et al., “Insights”; Kerr and Kelly; Kerr and Patti; Kitchen et al., “The Emergence”; Reid et al.). Such a tactical level of integration is important to corporate communication discourse (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*), brand communication (Kitchen and Tourky), and theorizing IMC practice (Ots and Nyilasy).

On the other hand, strategic integration connects to managerial-based activities within corporations and organizations. Corporate or strategic-wide integration touches employers’ relations and external stakeholders like media agencies, government organizations, and the public (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Ots and Nyilasy; Van Riel and Fombrun). It also monitors marketing communication activities from a financial perspective (Šerić). Strategic communication is part of the IMC development process that redefines the scope of marketing communication by gathering and refining information, evaluating feedback, building customer databases, and monitoring financial performance (Podnar and Golob). On the strategic level also comes integration as an organized labor that ensures corporate legitimacy and prevents hypocrisy (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*).

In the end, both tactical and strategic levels of integration require aligning consistent tone, characters, visual representation, and other executional components (Petrisson and Wang) before calling integration an “organizing ideal” (Johansen and Andersen) or an embodiment of corporate values (Kitchen and Schultz, *Raising the Corporate Umbrella*). Based on scanning technical integration on both strategic and tactical levels, integration within IMC satisfies the criteria for being an act of the “bringing together of things,” however not necessarily to the

extent that it integrates “economies, cultures, religions, ideas, and so on” (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications* 37).

On the other hand, philosophical integration refers to the means of social integration pulled from Habermas’s public sphere theory and communicative rationality. Habermas conceptualizes philosophical/social integration as a linguistically mediated interaction and a communicative act that has three requirements:

1. An ethic of conviction that systematizes all spheres of life and anchors purposive-rational action orientations in the personality system in a value-rational way (Protestant ethic); further,
2. A social subsystem that guarantees cultural reproduction of the corresponding value orientations (religious congregation and family); and
3. A system of compulsory norms that is suited by its formal structure to require of actors, as legitimate behavior, the purposive-rational, exclusively success-oriented pursuit of their own interests in an ethically neutralized domain (civil law). (Habermas, *Volume 2* 219)

Habermasian integration transmits culturally stored knowledge in which the action is the medium. It keeps reproducing cultural traditions by tracking norms into their theory-appropriate contexts. Social integration constructs an internal control on behaviors and on the formation of personality structures.

In response to the question of structuring an ethical approach to integration based on deliberate or humanistic boundarylessness, some answers can be found in humanistic IMC studies. The primacy of the human consumer within IMC appears in early studies. It shows in the role of integration (Schultz and Schultz; Thorson and Moore) as well as in marketing studies



pioneered by Philip Kotler. Thorson and Moore give special attention to the synergy of persuasive voices and to the role of cultural context in conceptualizing global IMC (Grein and Gould; Gould; Gould et al.). These studies resonate from a humanistic-based approach to marketplace studies rooted in communication ethics and economic justice (Schaefer et al., *The Evolution*).

Rhetorical and philosophical approaches to the humanistic turn are also important within IMC literature. Pursuit utilizes the rhetoric of Cicero, Habermas's philosophy of the public sphere, and Hauser's vernacular theory. Vernaculars, here, are formed by a discursive process of judgment and interpretation that requires rhetorical competence (Hauser). Pursuit utilizes Cicero's "decorum" to suggest an IMC praxis that is attentive to the interplay of humanism, social media, and the role of commercial organization in forming cultures.

Groom also engages with the humanistic turn to IMC. She applies a reflexive discussion in which the hermeneutics of the "play" metaphor is suggested to describe the relationship between audiences and messages (Groom, "The Next Integration"). This discussion unpacks the specifications and interplay of the hermeneutic space and place within IMC praxis. Groom also brings Kliatchko and IMC closer to humanistic communication and rhetorical studies. She utilizes notions from Schrag's communicative praxis such as the ethics of the fitting response to ground a humanistic perspective of IMC. The ethic of the fitting response resonates with embodied communicative ethics within human nature, which need expression, responsibility, and ontological, existential, and moral courage to emerge (Arneson, *Communicative Engagement*). It is rooted in Schrag's transversal rationality, which balances between the universal and the particular and between the self and Others. Groom concludes by highlighting the role of narrative as shared stories that regulate communal and social lives. Her contribution improves

the integrated experiences based on generated communication not abstractive generalizations. She emphasizes that narrative and communication “cannot guarantee an ethic of the fitting response, it does make explicit the association between rhetoric, ethics, and praxis-informed action as a point of departure for enlarged thinking and the possibility of an ethic of the fitting response” (154).

Similar studies appear on the qualitative and humanistic side of IMC studies. Calvin Troup (2008) explores human rationality from an ancient rhetorical approach. He connects contemporary public discourse to “the norms of traditional political rhetoric common to western-style democracies since Periclean Athens” (442). He examines the role of public deliberation in public relations to establish an ethical perspective that is free of exclusion and offensive judgement. By giving such a historical justification, Troup opens public deliberation for ordinary people and for grounding an ethical, practical, and rhetorical version of public relations.

The scholarly response to Schultz’s idea of integration appears widely in the literature. Duncan and Moriarty read the importance of integration as an increasing awareness of the role of communication within entire market relationships. Kitchen and De Pelsmacker emphasize that “IMC is the integration of communication activities, preferably driven by customers and their needs. IMC draws upon any and every communication discipline, as and when needed” (83). Another important study by Kitchen et al. highlights this communicative base of IMC (“The Emergence”). This study sees in IMC an additive value that communicates humanely and strategically compared to traditional marketing, and it sees integration as the power that drives marketing communication programs. Kliatchko takes this humanistic route to exploring integration. Instead of seeing customers as financially valuable digits within marketing profiles,

he expands the idea of the consumer as a human person. This perspective is important to emphasize in IMC ethics later.

The resonance of Schultz et al. (*Integrated Marketing Communication*) and Schultz's ("The Inevitability") notion of integration reaches corporate communication studies, as well. Cornelissen explores the rhetoric and teleological reasoning underpinning IMC, rather than dwelling in the empirical studies saturating the field. Cornelissen departs from the following text found in Schultz:

More important, in communication systems, the whole is generally greater than the sum of the parts. It is this increasing recognition of a holistic, systemic process of communication in which there are all types of synergies that will inevitably drive the acceptance and use. ("The Inevitability"143)

Cornelissen resonates with other studies in corporate communication when quoting Schultz. Christensen et al. (*Corporate Communications*) and Van Riel and Fombrun see integration as the adaptation of the parts to the whole to tolerate differences, utilizing a symbolic interplay of fiction and non-fiction. In other words, IMC in general becomes the interplay of the parts and the whole along with the readiness of the whole to encompass difference in communicative consistency (Tafesse and Kitchen). Cornelissen argues that IMC studies should be rhetorical and ideological with a pragmatic purpose that can legitimize marketplace changes affecting marketing and communication. Leaning toward corporate communication studies and *Raising the Corporate Umbrella* (Kitchen and Schultz) pushes IMC to have an organizational competitive advantage among other corporate strategies (Kitchen et al., "Integrated").

The shifted "system of information storage" that consumers relied on in the 1980s to support their purchasing decisions changed to a generalized perception lacking attention to right

or rational information (Schultz et al., *Integrated*). Slow consumer decisions have been energized by quick promotional activities that are centralized on a “price war” appearing in the form of coupons, discounts, rebates, etc. (Usunier and Lee). This competitive pricing strategy has been popular within international marketing activities to gain market share. Such a technical marketing strategy sends a public message that a product’s abundance is always in favor of the customer. There will be another personalized option that suits a customer’s preference when the tendency is to keep searching for other sources. New media and database marketing coupled with the power of IMC, consumers’ “interactivity,” and connectedness to the marketplace becomes the norm (Peltier et al.). People started to enjoy the independence of collecting, sharing, and re-creating information to maximize their consumption experiences. Instead of knowing all the details about a specific product, service, or market offering, people skim the surface for a minimal amount of information to keep themselves updated. Schultz follows up with an interesting study about the inevitability of integration (“The Inevitability”). He sees it as a truth, a radical planning and implementation tool, and a persuasive communication strategy that suits market fragmentation. People already perceive information about market corporations anyway, and integration becomes non-negotiable.

As a result, the ethical concerns in IMC literature inherited from advertising and marketing ethics point to contradictions in corporate claims that aspire to practice integration (Kliatchko). Humanistic IMC cannot find a place in the disconnect between technical integration as the unification of public perception and philosophical integration as the contextualization of cultural production. Ethics in IMC studies suffers moral muteness and moral myopia that appear within mediated presentations on a global scale. Individualism becomes the main reason behind such an ethical contradiction in IMC studies. Kliatchko sees individualism as “man’s reduction

or self-devaluation into self-centeredness, egotism and idolatry” (72). In this context, individualism manifests as the increased emphasis on human individuality, awareness of the self, self-interestedness, and eagerness for individual reward or gain. Such an individualistic understanding sustains IMC studies because it resonates with the humanistic and consumer-based claims grounding the theory. Successful implementation of IMC programs depends on a set of value-based principles that are consumer centric (Schultz and Schultz). It is an implementation that depends on specific demographic, geographic, behavioral, and psychological information about prospective customers.

Take Netflix as an example. Netflix is a relatively young but leading entertainment brand in TV shows and movie streaming. It competes with older corporations, such as Disney, in the qualities of winning consumer relevancy and public engagement (“Best Global Brands 2021”). Netflix’s worldwide presence appeals to audiences from diverse demographic and geographic groups around the world, which shows how communicative competence surpasses cultural differences, subcultural identifications, and moral constructs. Since 2012, Netflix has been doing integration very well. The so-called Netflix culture that represents its work environment and organizational relations engages in the organized labor of reshaping social reality beyond the consumption of its digital commodities and toward infinite cycles of meaning making. By exploring Netflix’s integrated communication on both strategic corporate and tactical promotional levels, the public can spot an ethical and humanistic paradox. Netflix’s diverse culture promotes relational and communal respect and rejects any form of marginalization and bias. People from different backgrounds, identities, values, and cultures work together to maximize the financial returns of mediated content.

In reality, Netflix's products carry offensive, racially discriminating, and culturally misrepresentative messages. The company's performance illustrates an ethical conflict within the technicality of doing integration on a global scale. It is an example of communication that struggles between actualizing universal moral values while preserving local and particular cultural boundaries. The fragility of such an integration appears when the corporate narratives claim to promote humanistic assertions through their public actions. However, these assertions preserve a moral muteness when it comes to stereotyping and racially portraying distant Others. Netflix is a strong illustration of the role of advertising and mediated content in expanding the sphere of ideology. It feeds the gap between theoretical humanistic promises of integration and the unethical practices of integration in reality. Netflix illustrates the impossibility of cultural integration within global branding, keeping in mind integrated orientalism (the power of textual representation) and IMC as a culturally biased theory.

Rethinking integration in light of Said's discourse model solidifies the power of man-made mediated representation that tolerates being true or false. Said sees that "all representations are necessarily unreliable because they are "embedded first in the language and then in the culture, institutions, and political ambience of the representer" (Kennedy 29). Holistic means that representations are ingrained within social and cultural systems. Something like the formation of knowledge emerges from within a community of interpreters not isolated from humanist angles. Said's hermeneutics does that when he engages "conservative literary and cultural biases" by exploring comparative literature, politics, and culture (Kennedy 1). Representation presupposes a dialectic nature that requires consumption. Discourse puts production and consumption of representation in a dialectal relationship. Once a representation is put before the public, all the

boundaries preventing it from being consumed, analyzed, or critiqued are lifted. Any mediated, external representation becomes an extension of the self.

### **4.3. Conclusion**

Said utilizes the discursive formation model in a way that offers more than the goal of Foucault's deconstructivism. Said highlights how criticism can be a living tool to assess real life issues. Studying IMC in light of the attributes of the critical discourse extracted from Said and Habermas presents a living understanding of universal-humanitarian communication ethics that connects power, representation of power, and public participation with critical communication ethics. IMC discourse as a communicatively rational act that has powerful privileges in the marketplace creates an ethical environment for humanistic integration.

Consider two teams with Habermas on Team A and Said on Team B. Both offer an understanding of discourse that can assist IMC ethics. Team (A) leans on "consensus" from Kantian rationalism to later modern philosophies. Team (B) cannot steer away from the role of power that controls the process of rationality and access to knowledge. Said presents a musical performance and a rearrangement of intellectual affiliation with other philosophers creating a moral community (Massad, "Affiliating"). It is a communal perception freed from man-made generalizations about the distant Other. Said aligns modernism to postmodernism and withdraws from the public discourse of activism and an abstract academy (Iskandar and Rustom 9). He abides by the generosity that the interpretive act has to offer. He engages with media literacy criticism, which enables him to examine ideologies and their interaction with politics, aesthetics, culture, and society.

Between consensus and power, IMC borrows from both notions. There is a global consensus on the importance of integrating common and social goods when doing marketing

communication. Brands have been raising their humanistic and corporate social responsibility by being inherently more purposeful in their persuasive efforts, which are always monitored by the public's access to information technology. Ordinary consumers have been gaining the power to assess communitive acts coming from their favorite brands, competitors, media critics, and public policies. All stakeholders have a value to protect and promote.



## Chapter 5

### Critical Constructive Pedagogy for IMC

The previous chapters focused on IMC as a representation of power that offers potentials for public participations. In this chapter, IMC as a critical constructive praxis grounded in Calvin O. Schrag's transversal rationality explores those potentials as they appear in the IMC pedagogical experience carried by teachers and students, graduate and undergraduate programs, and universities. Keeping in mind that integration is an activity-based discipline, an understanding of the practical role of IMC in shaping education and vice versa is required to reach a humanistic and ethical version of integration. Studies that discuss curricular development, theories, methodologies, and means of preparing students as future IMC professionals depend on what is happening already in the market. Learning from best practices and setting professional standards come from what is happening in the market and what deserves to be honored, appreciated, and globalized. When such a practical approach is adopted as the norm in IMC classrooms, the gap between tactical and strategic integration increases. It distracts students from focusing on integration as a holistic strategy that should protect different aspects, especially on the cultural, ethical, and humanistic levels. Most popular IMC textbooks open theoretical discussions with case studies that focus on either tactical or strategic aspects, while neglecting the basic connotation of integration as the act of bringing things together. The same popular textbooks reflect the gap between integration as a corporate-wide strategic approach to align internal and external corporate matters and integration as a mere tactical alignment of promotional mix tools.

Critical thinking, a major pedagogical skill that helps students make tactical-strategic connections, is not actually a priority in IMC education, which prevents students as prospective

professionals from applying constructive criticism to explore dimensions of integration necessary for intercultural and global branding. Trusting global brands alone to spread cultural and moral values allows biased and offensive representations of Otherness to sustain the marketplace. Critical thinking appears to be neglected as a result of the constant state of defense with which the notion of integration has been involved since the 1990s (Tafesse and Kitchen), which does not help to sort the scholarly conflicts between the organizational route to integration, the message approach to integration, tool-based integration, and the conceptual divide in the autonomy of integration (Duncan and Everett). Instead, emphasizing the tactical direction of integration promotes IMC's loss in the Western educational system and the culture of specialization.

This dissertation contributes to IMC discourse by bringing the metaphors and scholars discussed in previous chapters into a critical constructive praxial pedagogy. This praxis is central to Schrag's transversal rationality, which resembles a balance between the universal and the particular and between the criticism of power and the creativity of the constructive alignment of difference and Otherness. Such a conceptual framework becomes important to IMC education. It brings the notion of balance closer to the intellectual preparation that IMC pedagogical experience needs. From within transversal rationality, IMC explores the dialogical dimensions important to discussions of cultural differences. Transversal rationality grounds a form of acknowledgment of the particular, which IMC teaching and learning needs. It aligns consciousness, time, space, place, and rhetorical competence within a communal environment that cares for Otherness and difference, and it embraces the balance between teaching as a sacred act and as a form of intellectual entertainment that recalls responsiveness, self-criticism, and open-mindedness while seeking truth.

All of that appears when Michael J. Hyde views teaching as “an ethical activity requiring rhetorical competence” (*The Life-Giving Gift* 159). He continues, “When you observe the great teacher at work, you should be witnessing an event where, among others things, a life-giving gift is being shared in an appropriate and awe-inspiring manner” (159). A transversal rationality builds “departmental excellence” in which “[e]ducational institutions function as guardians of the liberal arts, critical thinking, and speaking skills necessary to function in civil society” (Arnett and Fritz). Through a critical and constructive understanding of integration guided by transversal rationality there appears the constitutive role of IMC teaching and learning within the public sphere. IMC education helps to establish moral standards that academic departments and institutions should consider while preparing students as future practitioners.

This chapter starts with an overview of the IMC educational brand, a term initiated by Gayle Kerr. This recap will cover IMC as an activity-based discipline in which IMC curricula, theories, methodologies, and preparation for the marketplace depend on what is happening currently in practice (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). The overview also focuses on the deficiencies of developing IMC pedagogy based solely on practice and how such a practice-based pedagogy increases the gaps between tactical and strategic integration, discussed earlier in Chapter 4. The following section explores Schrag’s notion of transversal rationality and the potentials of this concept in relation to the idea of the university. It covers the notion from different conceptual dimensions to show its value to IMC, cultural differences, and Otherness. Transversal rationality offers the balance that IMC needs to lessen the gap between tactical and strategic integration. From there appears structure that grounds a critical constructive pedagogy for IMC, presenting a holistic, humanistic, and ethical understanding of integration. It is a praxis central to critical thinking and a constructive creative interpretation of difference.

## 5.1. Why and How IMC Is an Activity-Based Theory

By tracking the emergence, development, and maturity of IMC, one can see how IMC is an activity-based theory and an academic area of study. Schultz et al. explain that as follows:

Teaching and training in most colleges and universities have been activity-based that is, how to develop advertising campaigns, how to prepare sales promotion programs, etc.

Courses and entire curricula have been developed along those lines and faculty and students have pursued these programs to their ultimate end - a degree, diploma, certificate or other official recognition. (*The Evolution* 9)

Since the Medill School launched the first master's program in IMC studies in the late 1980s, IMC as an independent discipline has been examined according to classroom, teaching, curricula, and workplace needs (Caywood and Ewing). IMC started from a contribution to advertising and mass media and developed toward an independent discipline influenced by practice. However, systematic efforts to shape the IMC educational brand have always been centered on marketing communication practices (Kerr), and the need for IMC education to guide ethical practices appears to be missing. IMC reserves its image as an activity-based discipline in three major phases: when the theory first emerged, during its developmental years, and within the contemporary status of the discipline.

IMC initially emerged as a capitalistic response to the political consequences that hit the global market after World War II. Various scholars within IMC studies (Kitchen and Schultz, "IMC"), and others in sociology (Beck, *Cosmopolitan*), economics, journalism (Friedman), and criticism (Bauman), invested in studying market changes during the 1960s, 70s, and 80s. The revolution of the mass marketing and mass production of the 1920s and 30s came to end (Ewen). Schultz and Schultz make a point of departure from "globalization," advanced technology, and

the development of “branding” in conceptualizing IMC. Earlier in the 1950s, corporate communication studies started searching for the roots of integration and unification, which currently strengthen the conceptual background of IMC (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Van Riel and Fombrun).

Recognizing that the study of IMC was a response to market activities actualizes the classic role of intellectual theory shaping market logic and vice versa. Muller (2002) tracks this intellectual role of capitalism by unpacking the philosophies of Weber, Voltaire, Smith, and Möser. Zygmunt Bauman presents an extensive focus on the role of market logic in transforming the meaning of the intellectual, the consumer, and taste. It is affected by the dimmed role of family businesses and the rising role of political legislation. Political praxis controls how market logic rearranges “market-seduction tools” and the integration of social, psychological, and existential justifications of business life and purchase decisions (Bauman, page number). The hegemony of market rationality has gradually increased control over commodities, consumers’ taste, and related theoretical development. The emergence of IMC theory is an illustration of this growing control.

Within the early days of its emergence, the development of the IMC educational brand synchronized. Scholars explored curricular planning and development in the early 1990s (Rose and Miller, “Integrated Communications”). They also focused on measuring pedagogical returns on students’ responsiveness and achievements after graduation in the late 1990s (Griffin and Pasadeos). However, it was not until the early 2000s (Carroll) that studies started to focus on the degree of alignment between the classroom and the marketplace and how the marketplace can benefit from theory development. Later, Kerr marked an important milestone in IMC education. He started referring to the academic process of teaching, developing, and learning IMC as an

“educational brand.” He presented a Western (Australian) perspective that has been widely cited in the literature because it explores probabilities and collective judgement and tracks marketing and advertising trends (Daymon and Holloway; Kerr and Patti). Kerr’s goal was to address two issues: the change needed in advertising and public relations curricula and the department or school in which IMC should be located. He surveyed a group of professionals working in advertising and public relations using the Delphi method. Kerr explored “the place of IMC in the university environment,” curriculum content, teaching, learning, research, challenges facing future IMC education, and the global reach or diffusion of IMC education (Kerr). The study came from a need to overcome the fragmented nature of IMC’s disciplinary identity. The professional respondents surveyed by Kerr varied in their perspectives of IMC, with some seeing it as an independent area of study that should be separate from advertising or marketing and others seeing it as a part of marketing programs and business schools. Kerr concluded that this fragmentary nature of talking about the IMC discipline lacks a grounded understanding of what IMC education has to offer.

Kerr and Kelly built on Kerr’s study with an additive value focusing on “digital disruption” and its effect on IMC education. Kerr and Kelly argue that “IMC thinking” is important to challenge digital disruption by developing IMC curriculum and branding. Digital disruption can be found in technology that tracks public information as well as in the marriage of traditional and new media (Kliatchko and Schultz). Kitchen et al.’s comprehensive study touches upon digital disruption and how it transforms societies (“Integrated”). Many more related studies appear in the *Journal of Integrated Marketing Communication*, a publication of Medill School that prioritizes IMC inquiry as conceptualized by Schultz. The journal responds to the increasing needs of sharpening the IMC perspective according to Medill School’s efforts initiated in the

1990s. The focus of the journal is to cover marketing and business-related problems that respond to the dynamic market affected by big data, branding, and global fragmentation.

One example of digital disruption can appear from new social media platforms. Dan Skinner talks about the shift from organic share of information and reception of feedback toward the concept of promoted posts through paid advertising. Instead of accumulating public attention around brands, companies now use social media to introduce new ideas and goods. Here emerges the strategy of choosing the proper platform to speak to a brand's position and identity. What works for a company using Facebook might not work for other campaigns and platforms. Although in an indirect way, the journal utilizes rhetorical theory and communication theory to explore IMC in relation to ethical practices and moral criteria. Eliane Karsaklian (2016) explores advertising practices and ethics in relation to ethical consumption, motivation behind self-actualization, or social conformity. In the same 2016 issue, Steve Dodd tackles privacy and security in the age of social media. The two approaches that maintain ethical practices, for Dodd, include having "Ruth" the opposite of ruthless by keeping the consumer in mind while implementing new strategies. It also includes thinking according to "Opt-In" mode that gives consumers higher levels of control over what they share and disclose.

A comparison of early and late IMC studies shows a shift in focus and interests from the late 1990s to today. In the early days, the Medill School's IMC program received split comments in terms of feedback. Some found the program as "nothing new" compared to what advertising and public relations programs have to offer (Eagle et al., "Perceptions of Integrated Marketing Communications"). From this perspective, it sounded strange to teach marketing and communication in one program (Carroll; Rose and Miller; Griffin and Pasadeos; Wightman). Other scholars saw in the program a new way of developing the advertising field based on solid

mass communication studies that centralize discussions of “persuasion” and “integration” (Kerr). Others perceived integration as a saving mode that works within internal organizational structure to challenge leadership problems and turf wars (Caywood and Ewing; Rose and Miller, “Integrated”; “Merging Advertising”). However, what has been maintained is the tendency of IMC studies to feed its practice-based foundation.

IMC as a contemporary, mature discipline still maintains its image as an activity-based discipline. There is increasing awareness of the need for independent pedagogical preparation for IMC education. The deficiencies of early advertising and public relations education in preparing students for the marketplace is a major criticism in the discipline. Such a philosophical foundation of advertising education is important to overcome gaps in IMC education. Trujillo and Toth also discuss this need from the side of public relations. They draw from the organizational theories of Burrell and Morgan to aid their understanding of organizing schemes and the role of an organizational perspective in public relations.

Contemporary study of IMC has its own challenges. When it comes to pure academic complexity, the culture of specialization that characterizes Western education does not help IMC (Wightman). Students build their academic profiles and training based on many decisions, like choosing a discipline, program, major, and minors. The appearance of IMC as a new academic program has increased that fragmentation. The bureaucracy of academic institutions also contributes to the fragmentation of the discipline. The organizational structure within universities “is generally not conducive to integration” (Kerr and Kelly). As a result, IMC scholars struggle to find a justified place for the discipline within other related programs. It is lost between business programs, liberal arts schools, communication departments (Kerr), and marketing and journalism minors (Stuhlfaut and Farrell). All of these factors affecting the pedagogical position



of IMC add to the scholarly resistance from advertising, public relations, journalism, and mass communication programs and educators toward teaching integration. For instance, the Educational Affairs Committee of the Public Relations Society of America resists the introduction of IMC, arguing that the field/study/practice? of public relations provides broader organizational functions (Rose and Miller, “Merging”). Such an inside-out approach neglects how both advertising and public relations practitioners hold similar views on key IMC fundamentals, such as the priority of winning audiences (Schultz et al., *Integrated*).

Other than disciplinary wars, a major concern surrounding contemporary IMC education involves the ramifications of technology (Kerr and Kelly) and globalization (Schultz et al., *The Evolution*). The digital revolution not only affects practical IMC, but it also transforms the IMC educational brand in academic institutions, in curricula management and development, in its role in marketplace practices, and in the entire digital world. In the digital age, IMC education faces problems such as a lack of a unified global reference to exploring, managing, and controlling data analysis (Creedon and Al-Khaja), lack of interpretive and critical apparatuses that can respond to realistic complexities (Kerr and Kelly), and, most importantly, fascination with big data that neglects opposing calls to validate its existence in the first place (Tafesse and Kitchen). Globalization, on the other hand, also shapes the internationalization of higher education according to neoliberal ideologies (Le Ha and Barnawi 2015), embedding neo-colonial mentality and deterministic education models. The popularity of the English language plays an important role in commodifying higher education through the control of policies, practices, and pedagogy. Globalization attends to the fast-paced cycle of production and consumption in which the producer decides how to represent the consumer.

The marketplace does not engage in determining the best route to integration, whether organizational, message-based, or tool-based. The marketplace omits the conceptual divide in the autonomy of integration (Duncan and Everett) and the culture of specialization in the Western educational system (Kerr). In efforts to lessen that gap, Schultz et al. propose the three circles model for IMC theory development (*The Evolution*). Kerr comments that each circle unfolds important theories and that together they can achieve “magical” harmony within the core of IMC. Schultz et al.’s study focuses on the perspective of IMC educators by analyzing syllabi to understand IMC content, delivery, and audience patterns of responsiveness. They propose an IMC theory development containing three circles central to integration: the “audience circle,” which refers to any stakeholder, whether internal or external to an organization; the “delivery circle,” or the channel through which IMC programs are implemented; and the “content circle” concerning messages, information, and incentives.

Another challenge comes from neglecting qualitative IMC studies to lessen the gaps between strategic and tactical integration and between IMC practice and theory. Current integration-focused studies have been tackling issues like the role of conceptualizing integration to help advance practice and pedagogy (Kliatchko; Schultz et al., *The Evolution*), the role of integration in internal and external organizational mission and postmodern marketing theories (Kitchen and Uzunoglu), and the role of integration as a value-based and managerial strategy that emerged to increase profit (Gould; Schultz and Schultz; Thorson and Moore). However, investment in the tactical promotional and strategic corporate-wide levels and the systematic interplay of both tactical and strategic have been neglected (Kliatchko). The IMC educational brand is not keeping up with the conceptual divide in the autonomy of integration (Duncan and Everett) nor with the culture of specialization in the Western educational system (Kerr;

Wightman). Qualitative research provides IMC with critical insight into the communicative ground underpinning IMC, which is helpful when exploring humanistic and cultural contexts (Daymon and Holloway). Here, meaning making connects communicative phenomenon to the complexity of humanity operating within social and organizational relations.

### **5.1.1. Awards Set the Standards**

In IMC, standards are set by what is happening in practice and what deserves to be honored and appreciated. Award winning sets the standard for what to call ethical or valuable integration within the fields of IMC and mass communication. Fu explains how “standardized advertising” fits itself in the global industry. Rather than recognizing the most creative idea those drive the most financial values to corporate brands, global advertising endorses the Western dominance of the market. The US, the UK, and Germany are the most awarded countries (Fu). Such ranking reflects the domination of practical meanings of integration in representing cultures in creative symbolic languages. Organizations and agencies that distribute awards set the benchmark for creativity and what is considered worthy of representation and publicity (Fu). Corporate lead in creating an ethical perspective that is important to a certain public in a specific time becomes the standard in IMC and related fields.

For example, Dubai Lynx is an annual professional event owned by Cannes Lion international agency, which connects agencies, clients, practitioners, and students under the hub of media, advertising, and creativity. This agency tracks best practices in the MENA region, assigning a specific award for practices that best comply with the means of integration under the Integrated Lynx.

The Integrated Lynx celebrate work that uses multiple media platforms. Entries should demonstrate the integration of chosen elements or channels throughout the campaign, and

how the different media complemented and built on each other to drive tangible business results, were instrumental to cultural change or integral in the achievement of brand purpose. (“Dubai Lynx 2022”)

This statement sets the threshold for the best professional practices in the MENA region. To enter the competition, an integrated campaign should utilize multiple channels and points of interaction with consumers for the aim of influencing social and behavioral changes. The Integrated Lynx award comes in addition to other categories including Best Brand Experience, Digital Award, and Most Creative Strategy Award. The award embraces an understanding of integration that does not deviate from Schultz’s school in which every branded act is a part of defining the corporate body. It is apparent within the statement above that Lynx’s understanding of integration still operates in the technical zone. Yet, it attempts to reconcile between integration as a one-voice mediated mission and integration as an opportunity for cultural development and changes.

Take *An-Nahar* newspaper as an illustration of this idea. *An-Nahar* (translated in English as “The Day”) has been one of the most prestigious publications in Lebanon since 1933. In March 2022, its representative agency IMPACT BBDO, Dubai, won the Integration Award at the Dubai Lynx (“Dubai Lynx 2022”). IMPACT BBDO’s practice of integration adds to the traditional idea of one branding voice, containing a hint of a political move that stands for the Lebanese citizens’ right to vote. *An-Nahar*’s winning communicative strategy was born as a business response to a real life issue and from faith in the ability of a brand experience to battle political corruption in Lebanon. In February 2022, the newspaper decided not to print one of the weekly issues in order to donate the paper and ink to government institutions printing election ballots. Newsstands across the country noted: “we did not print the newspaper in order to print

our voice for history” (“Dubai Lynx 2022”). This symbolic move aimed to speed the democratic performance in Lebanon, hoping for immediate political reformation after a series of catastrophic events that disturbed the nation. This integration strategy was activated through non-print media, blank outdoor billboards, and a QR code that brought the interaction online. The non-printed newspaper issue, represented by a refusal to print, went viral on social media. People began to engage with the campaign by donating paper, books, and other resources to the government. Other Lebanese press companies joined the movement by donating printing supplies, as well. Feedback was positive from local and political TV shows, radio stations, and election candidates, all engaging to support the movement. *An-Nahar* scored the highest virtual rates of reading and viewing for that March edition. In response, the government stopped complaining about the shortage of paper and ink and promised more punctual deadlines in the election process.

Cannes Lion, the French mother agency owning Dubai Lynx, works to identify best practices in the global industry. Its priority is the creative works, their context, and their relevancy to local audiences (Jardine). In 2012, the Grand Prix at the Dubai Lynx Awards went to a local Egyptian agency that resembled in “silly” mockery the effect of the Arab Spring on people’s lives. The series promoted a snack brand that featured clips of a man playing with a toy gun that turned any target into a bag of chips. All surroundings were affected by the act such as objects and people. Hall noted, “nothing is safe.” Mr. Ali, the agency’s representative, said, “We were always told in the past that consumers were stupid and would never get the idea, but the revolution has proved the consumer is not stupid” (Hall). The post-Arab Spring MENA region has since then proved how the role of digitalization and social media ignite and drive reality in a way that shapes what could be considered “acceptable.”

The tendency to set the standards of the IMC discipline according to best practices demonstrates the role that the intellectual plays in IMC. This tendency feeds the image of IMC as an activity-based discipline responding to market logic. It also extends Ogilvy's concern about the need to be "intellectually honest" within advertising agencies. Do advertisers combine statistics, psychology, critical thinking skills, writing skills, and communication skills to create a balance needed for the industry? Do they utilize intellectual honesty in order to prevent personal bias and prejudice from appearing in practice? Both Bauman and Habermas discussed the critical role of the intellectual emerging from a balance of political discussions and public opinion. The act of communicative rationality determines the quality of the culture-consuming public. It is an act that separates the dimensions of critical consciousness from manipulative publicity. The way in which people perceive marketing communication activities determines their social-psychological traits as well as their attitudes and shared interests.

IMC is an activity-based discipline because it emerged as a response to global market logic. It developed its theoretical weight by leaning on market needs combined with classroom and research feedback. It continues to maintain its disciplinary image as a practice passed that sets the standards for best practices based on award-winning campaigns and promotional programs. However, the moral role of the intellectual appears to be minimal and neglected. The search for universal truth becomes a purely corporate mission that lacks humanistic taste or attentiveness to cultural differences and biases. With hope in this intellectual role, this chapter emphasizes the potential of the IMC educational brand within the idea of the university. The next chapter aligns what is known about IMC education with the transversal version of rationality set by Schrag.

## 5.2. Transversal Rationality

Calvin O. Schrag (b. 1928) is professor emeritus at Purdue University. He studies hermeneutics, linguistics, semiotics, textuality, and narrativity, and he explores different representations of the self in order to show the narrative-based, dialectic, and communicative dimensions of interactions with the Other (*The Self*). From this broad philosophical background, Schrag developed his major work in philosophy of communication: the notion of communicative praxis, which eventually carries what he calls transversal rationality (Ramsey and Miller). Transversal rationality is a term that first appeared in *The Resources of Rationality* (1992), a text that brings a balance between the universal and the particular. Schrag develops the notion of transversal rationality, responding to the “crises of our ethical and cultural existence” (*Convergence* 78). About the origins of transversality in general, Schrag says:

It is used in topological mathematics as a generalization of orthogonality, articulating the convergence of lines and surfaces that is not reducible to coincidence. The term is used to describe the overlapping of fibers in physiology. In anatomy, the connection of vertebrae is an example of what is termed transversal unity. In subatomic particle theory, physicists speak of the transverse mass of particles. But you can't reduce its meaning to any one of these areas. It traverses these different contexts as well as others, which is one of the things that intrigued me about it. (Ramsey and Miller 23)

Transversality is a concept that has multi-disciplinary connotations, for example, drawing on mathematics and related sciences. It refers to meanings of convergence, connections, and overlapping contexts that cannot be reduced to one another. Schrag develops his communicative contribution to transversality based on Jean-Paul Sartre's critique of Husserl's transcendental ego and consciousness. Schrag's project is also grounded in the critique of Descartes's epistemology,

the doubting of the doubt, and Edmund Husserl's (1859–1938) phenomenology of consciousness.

The transversal standpoint offers “convergence without coincidence, conjuncture without concordance, overlapping without assimilation, and union without absorption” (Schrag, *The Self*). Schrag's communicative version of transversality is grounded in the philosophy of discourse. He defines discourse as the “concrete amalgam of the events of speaking and the structure of language within a social practice” (*Convergence* 8). It is grounded in the Saussurean distinction between *parole* and *langue*. *Parole* appears in the everyday use of language, as in speaking and writing. *Langue* is the linguistic structure that distinguishes one language from another, like English from Arabic. Discourse emerges before *parole* or *langue*, before the empiricism of speech-act theory, and before linguistic science. It is a performance of expressivity and articulation of daily human elements and interactions. The linguistic enables discursive praxis in distinguishing *meaning* and *reference* because it operates in the realm of textuality and narrativity. Discourse becomes an “embodiment of texts” and “an emplotment of stories” (*Convergence* 8). The complexity of discourse appears when one assumes a linear development and connects “phonemes to words and then to sentences and texts, and finally to narratives” (*Convergence* 10). Such a linear understanding of language is empty of any internal justifications, which are important when narratives need a moment of recontextualization and re-configuration. Yet, the interplay of discourse and narration is never an empty labor; rather it refers to a transversal interpretive enterprise that feeds meaning making and reference.

Schrag's faith in achieving a “practical philosophy” can inform a range of systematic philosophical and rhetorical explanations (Arnett, “Practical Philosophy”). His exploration of critical hermeneutics underpinning communicative praxis is important to phenomenological



studies of the public sphere (Deetz et al.); to marginality, feminism, narrative, and social constitution within organizational communication (Mumby; Seeger and Kuhn); to the ethics of listening (Lipari); and to the role of language within the hermeneutics-epistemology debate (Langsdorf). Critical theory in the communicative context also informs the rhetoric and phenomenology of acknowledgment, in which acknowledging imperfection becomes a moral pursuit of the orator (Hyde, "Ethics" 32). These studies perform what Schrag means by saying that "deconstruction and re-creation always go together" in grounding the critical communicative praxis (Ramsey and Miller 8). The critical dimension within Schrag's communicative praxis is a combination of the hermeneutics of suspicion and a dialogical willingness to bring closer the self, the Other, and the world (Ramsey and Miller). It is a criticism that aids in unpacking an ethical fitting response that can assist IMC education and practice. It brings a transversal communicative engagement between opposing dimensions without imposing a single or biased perspective of what is right and proper.

By leaning on the philosophy of discourse, Schrag liberates decentered subjectivity from metaphysical and epistemological modernity, allowing a pragmatic context of embedded events and communicative agents to emerge (Arnett and Holba 230). Discourse becomes a subject capable of transcendentalism while situated in time, space, language, and community (Ramsey and Miller 99). For instance, Nadesan applies Schrag's understanding of the subject in organizational communication studies. Nadesan notes, "Transversing the philosophy of consciousness and the philosophy of decentered subjects is Schrag's temporalized, spatially situated, embodied self" (89). Nadesan highlights the significance of Schrag's ontology of the embodied self, which allows responsible and ethical interaction with the Other. Such a

transversal understanding of the embodied self creates the support that the implementation of IMC programs needs within internal organizational structures.

The “double duty” of transversality within philosophy of communication manifests through “relevance” to communicative praxis and through “ontological significance” (Ramsey and Miller 24). By being relevant to the principles of communication, transversal rationality distinguishes between absolute consensus and diversity. Relevance, here, “extends across contexts, overlaps contextual interpretations without singularizing them, and unifies the culture-spheres of science, morality, art, and religion without absorbing them into one” (Arneson, *Communicative Engagement* 32). On an ontological basis, transversal rationality creates a diagonal sense that differentiates between vertical universals and horizontal particulars. The notion becomes a dynamic understanding of communication that balances between particularity and universality, creating a unique fabric for the notion of diversity.

When applied to the idea of the university and IMC pedagogical experience, transversal rationality helps IMC pedagogy and grounds a critical constructive praxis for IMC that will conclude all the discussions of this dissertation. A transversal rationality offers the ethical and intellectual preparedness that an IMC critical constructive pedagogy needs.

### **5.3. Critical Constructive Pedagogy for IMC**

A critical constructive pedagogy for IMC is a theory-informed structure based on the interplay of IMC education and transversal rationality. It is a praxis that realizes the role of intellectual preparation and the idea of the university in preparing future IMC practitioners. Schrag’s work can bring different ideas and metaphors closer to philosophy of communication, and the idea of the university is one of them. The university is an important representation of Western moral philosophy. It is a well-established humanistic idea, which John Henry Newman

developed in *The Idea of a University Defined* (1873) and which George Marsden emphasized later in illustrating the soul of the American university.

Newman discusses the role of the university beyond distribution of knowledge and science. He brings the role of the sacred (in his case, Catholicism) to the center of knowledge production, especially liberal education. Both liberal and humanistic education give the mind a certain form that equates it with the body and happens through “polish of word and action” (Newman 157). The effects of knowledge are evident in a person’s power and influence through good sense, reasonableness, self-command, which can be developed into institutional and persuasive habits (168). Groom brings Newman to humanistic IMC grounded in rhetoric and philosophy of communication (“The Next Integration”). She emphasizes how intellectual and professional training prepares students for “refined sensibilities” needed in the marketplace. The university becomes a place for self-identification formed by a community of learners. It is a process manifested through social interaction, asking intelligent questions, and employing the means of integrity to pursue life.

Schrag approaches the idea of the university from the needs of his historical moment, asking how the university can actualize its role in the communication of knowledge in the technological age. Schrag says, “It is an urgent demand of the times that we apply the Socratic requirement of self-understanding to the institutional life of the university. The unexamined university is not worth operating” (“The Idea of the University” 98). The university in this context is “a historical institution, and as such it bears the inscriptions of its responses to the changing social conditions and the varied requirements of the times” (102). It has a historical nature rather than a metaphysical essence. Accordingly, it has always been responding to the surrounding environmental challenges characterizing different historical moments.

For example, in medieval Europe, the university stood in between political power and religious hegemony, trying to focus on rational inquiry. The university has been battling governmental power “without becoming politicized. It responded to the pressure of the church without becoming Christianized. It learned to live with bureaucracy without becoming bureaucratized” (Schrag, “The Idea of the University” 102). An institutional form of resistance appears in the idea of the university. It actualizes how Newman envisioned the intellectual-professional balance that works in parallel to universal-humanistic production of knowledge.

In comparison to Schrag’s portrayal, Alasdair MacIntyre presents in-depth elaborations on the struggle involving religion and the university in *God, Philosophy, Universities* (2009). He starts by clarifying that the conflicts between the three great medieval theistic civilizations—Byzantine Christianity, Islam, and the Latin West—are not about God but about the intelligibility needed to reach an understanding of God. Each religion has its own route to reach that understanding. For example, in Byzantine Christianity, the integration of the imperial bureaucratic hierarchy of the church and the neglect of education invoked the secular movements of their time. In the case of Islam, the prosperity of philosophy and science created a threat to political power, so all intellectual efforts began to be regulated and the studies of science, philosophy, and politics were combined under a single institution and authority. Finally, in the Latin West, complications arose between rival secular authorities wanting to establish theistic doctrines. Following this discussion, MacIntyre emphasizes the role of creativity and the philosophical question that can take different forms throughout history—for example, poetic, narrational, mythic, or ritualistic. The form of the philosophical question varies according to cultural differences, allowing intercultural dialogues with others and infinite possibilities of

answers to be generated. MacIntyre brings the unity of the university to a point of balance between moral philosophy and natural sciences working in parallel.

Going back to Schrag, his “portrait of the university” has three main features: First, the university is a community of researchers and scholars that should not be confused with a corporate institution. Second, the university as a community is a source of generating rational and critical inquiries. Third, researchers and scholars are communicators of knowledge within the university community. Groom has connected these three features to humanistic IMC, enlightened by Newman and philosophy of communication (“The Next Integration”). The notion of extracting intellectual preparation and self-identification from within the communal, rational, and critical environment of the university becomes the center of critical constructive pedagogy for IMC. Schrag sees the challenges of . . . in the hegemony of the corporate model, which operates within academic institutions driven by the power of the technological age. Corporate consciousness struggles to find a reflective critical perspective, especially since the technological revolution has dramatically altered the process of education and the transmission of information between educators and students.

Habermas discussed this point in *Legitimation Crisis* (1973). The dynamic development of advanced capitalism, according to social theory and the Marxian theory of crisis, has been spreading the corporate model to different types of institutions. “Advanced capitalism” is an expression that refers to the organized accumulation process formed by economic concentration. In systems theory, crises happen when there are few possibilities to maintain the well-being of the structure of the social system. Crises, here, are perceived as disturbances to system integration. Social system crises are not accidental but inherited in the system imperative, lacking integration within the social hierarchy. “Economic concentration” refers to the possibility

of the global market to exist along with national markets and the combination of national capabilities of organizing goods, capital, and labor (Habermas *Legitimation*). This condition of the market allows for the legitimation system to play a role through engaging the private citizen and creating motives for a better civil public, including educational institutions. Habermas sees in linguistic intersubjectivity a solution for the disturbed communicative organization of behavior for better decision-making systems. Within this Habermasian perspective, the mission of the university, with all communal, moral, and cultural meanings embedded within, can aid the critical enterprise necessary for both corporate and intellectual development.

Schrag's communal portrait of the university becomes a cultural force that determines the dynamics and the quality of education. Members of a community are rationally bounded by shared consciousness and experiences. The communicative praxis at the center of the educational experience, as in interpersonal communication or the circulation of critical thoughts, becomes invisible. Praxis is *prasso*, which means achieving or doing. Schrag, then, popularizes the term "praxis" as a theory-informed practice while structuring the philosophical discourse of communication studies (*The Communicative Praxis*). The communicative praxis is a methodology of humanistic criticism as well as a hermeneutical interplay of speech and action. It emerges from the role of linguistic game and the turn to the postmodern critique of foundationalism.

"Praxis" unpacks Ricœur's notion of modern existentialism, the phenomenology of Husserl and Merleau-Ponty, and Kierkegaard's philosophy. It also connects to the Aristotelian rhetorical tradition, receiving texture and a mode of expression. Drawing from Derrida, Ricœur, and Richard Rorty's studies on metaphor, "texture" refers to a fiber of meanings. The "mode of expression" is a verbal or nonverbal communication representative state of mind coming from

the so-called reference and narration. Communicative praxis achieves a new horizon of subjectivity through dialogical consciousness and decentered subjectivity, a counter-enlightenment interplay that eases the supremacy of philosophy of language over philosophy of action and vice versa.

This notion of praxis makes a good use of critical discernment, hermeneutic interpretation, and narrative articulation that is important to create an awareness enlightened by transversal rationality. About “transversal awareness,” Arneson says that it

brings to light the comprehensiveness of experience that informs communicative engagement. Rather than emphasizing a serial succession of moments of consciousness, the principle focus in transversal awareness is upon the interlaced assemblages and patterns of speech and action. (*Communicative Engagement* 44)

Transversal awareness illustrates the pragmatics of social practices, including a moment of critical discernment, a moment of hermeneutic interpretation done by a speaker, author, or actor, and another moment of narrative articulation received by the Other. The interplay of these three moments points to the ethical standards that critical constructive pedagogy should maintain while teaching and learning IMC. A transversal awareness gathers various discourses and modes of thought, all attending to the reality of Otherness. It is an awareness that Arneson extracts from the internal experiences formed by communicative engagement and an interplay of speech and action within. Here, communicative praxis guides the hermeneutic space of speech and action. In this space, universal and local cultural specifications (narratives) as well as respect for contextuality and temporality of the narratives of the Other allow a transversal communication to emerge.

When carried to the educational experience within universities, transversal rationality brings a form of balance between the universal and the particular and between the criticism of power and the creativity of the constructive alignment of difference and Otherness. Transversal rationality feeds IMC educational experiences with the necessary critical thinking skills and ethical constructs, and it eases the tension between universal hegemony and rationality (vertical universality and horizontal plurality) driven by postmodern suspicions of metanarratives (Wallulis). Transversal rationality offers a balance that can help IMC practice to sustain as a corporate power while respecting global differences.

In particular, critical discernment is the labor of evaluative criticism that allows for questions and answers to interact and for difference to emerge. In an interesting study, Zaharna makes a case from the interplay of intercultural communication and international public relations studies (“Intercultural Communication”). He departs from Edward T. Hall’s works on orality-based versus literacy-based cultures and low versus high context cultures. Instead, Zaharna examines the notion of credibility in public speaking in Saudi Arabia compared to the United States. In Saudi, the person who delivers a message carries greater significance and attention than what he says. A public speech is accepted as credible as long as a credible spokesperson is delivering it.

In another observation, Zaharna observes how Americans tend to receive information with underestimation compared to Saudis, who overestimate and exaggerate information (“Understanding”). This difference in the manner of receiving or processing information affects the credibility and truthfulness of statements. When carried to the pedagogical experience, such cultural differences enhance the educational exchange and promote more productive interaction. The need to pay attention to cultural differences is already recognized in public relations



pedagogy in the Middle East, and it helps “cultural inclusivity” of the region with the global atmosphere (Creedon and Al-Khaja). One of the features of such a global-to-local recognition reflects on the higher awareness of cultural differences and the role of critical thinking that IMC educators and textbooks try to maximize.

Hermeneutic interpretation is another criterion in the notion of communicative praxis. Hermeneutic interpretation is a form of implication resulting from the speaking subject that also leads to engagement in public and interpersonal dialogues. The development of self-implication creates another moment in communicative praxis, that of narrative articulation. Hermeneutic interpretation and narrative articulation together manifest as an interactive expression and as a rhetorical disclosure aimed toward Otherness. Here appears the role of historical narratives as important to the reflexive self, even though “no particular historical moment can be accepted forever as unchangeable and paradigmatic for communication” (Arnett and Arneson 37). Fu’s historical tracking of advertising discourse and racism illustrates the role of narrative articulation. She observes that:

reading of slavery-related ads, and the identification of the marked differences in rhetoric between the ads aimed at selling slaves and the ads aimed at controlling slaves, is also significant. It is by looking back to the earliest form of advertising as we know it in the West that we observe the raw source of racial stereotyping and the original form of racial commodification. (35)

The historical connection between the emergence of advertising and slavery points to sources of stereotyping and commodifying racial differences. Early advertising history also continues to form throughout the nineteenth-century colonial discourse, causing a form of “High

Imperialism” (Fu 61). Accordingly, conceptualizing and practicing integration as a commodity followed.

A critical constructive pedagogy for IMC responds to the main issue facing the field resulting from commodification. While theorists and teachers aim for a humanistic and philosophically justified integration, global brands morally struggle when it comes to meeting, knowing, or representing the Other in mediated content. Marketing activities promote individualism in favor of personalism (Kliatchko). IMC represents a form of being an “imperialist” idea (Rose and Miller, “Integrated Communications”), as it obeys what prime TV shows have to offer financially and value wise (Chesebro). IMC currently produces packaged and unified, one-sided representations of Otherness, contradicting Habermas’s social integration that transmits cultural narratives and knowledge. Social integration contextualizes theories and establishes social, behavioral, and personal laws or structures.

The Marxian understanding of commodification, or commodity fetishism, blurs the link between universal morality and a responsible justification of its substance in reality. Commodification comes in different forms. It resembles the tension between tactical and strategic integration as well as the loss of convergence between integration in theory and in practice. Polanyi in (Schaefer et al.) says that the idea of commodifying humanity is immoral. The rhetorical dimension within the neo-Marxist movements of the 1970s was a response to commodification. Commodification appears in the role of abstract and mathematical values in creating a rhetorical basis for economic science (Schaefer et al. 440). Habermas’s absorption of Marxism sees a representation of commodity fetishism in the expansion of capitalistic reproduction and its “universal developmental tendency” that contradicts humanity (Honneth and Joas 158). The commodification of humanity appears in IMC education, too, translating to the

void of moral and philosophical discussions in IMC curricula (Kerr). Without much philosophical justification, a term like “integrated communication” earns the fame and becomes a form of legitimizing corporate communication activity (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*). “Academic leadership” is still missing in establishing a consistent conceptual development between the discipline, the needs of the marketplace, and the education of future IMC practitioners (Kerr et al. “IMC Education”). Added to that is the way in which IMC studies emerged in the first place as a response to global market changes (Schultz and Schultz).

Between being understood as a modern market commodity or as a medium between corporations and consumers, integration stands in the middle of an ethical dilemma. Both Habermas’s ethical criticism and Said’s cultural criticism add a situated illustration of Schragian transversality that is responsible but not necessarily reciprocal. It embraces narrative standpoint from the meaning of Kantian oughtness. Kantian oughtness becomes “the marker that directs communicative attention to a ‘good,’ functioning as an engine for a given communicative ethic” (Arnett et al., “Communication Ethics”). Habermas’s critical communication ethics sets the pragmatics for social integration to work in reality. The validity claims at the center of his discourse ethics looks for truth, legitimacy of truth, and the resonance of that to the communicative setting. Truth, authenticity, and rightfulness create ethical standards and guidance, especially when Otherness and universal morality is involved.

#### **5.4. Conclusion**

Schrag’s philosophy of transversals is important to the core of this dissertation, and it inspires the role of integration in shaping IMC education. However, the question remains as to how the university can actualize the role of critical constructive pedagogy in teaching and learning integration in a way that can benefit the IMC educational brand. IMC is an activity-

based discipline that emerged as a marketplace response to the political consequences of World War II. Since then, the discipline has been reflective of market logic in shaping the role of the intellectual and the consumer. Market rationality takes the lead in theory development as well as in promoting commodities. Major and primary IMC studies since the late 1990s have been focusing on establishing an intellectual/practical alignment between classrooms and the corporate world. Yet, a solid pedagogical structure that supports IMC education is still missing. Leaning on the education of advertising and public relations spreads the deficiencies of those sub-disciplines to IMC. The culture of specialization and the bureaucracy of academic institutions characterizing Western education are also important factors. As a result, the IMC educational brand still suffers a conceptual divide in the autonomy of integration, and it continues to strengthen its practical base while neglecting moral and humanistic dimensions.

Transversal rationality in the educational context creates a sense of balance and a reconciliation between IMC practice and education. This notion works on shaping a critical constructive praxis for IMC on two levels: First, it lessens the gap between tactical and strategic integration in practice. Second, it grounds critical thinking skills within an ethical construct that IMC students need. Leaning solely on practice-based education allows biased judgment to sustain the marketplace. These two levels respond to the lack of critical skills needed by students while exploring the ethical dimensions of integration necessary for intercultural and global branding.

Instead, transversal rationality as the balance between the universal and the particular offers such a conceptual balance to IMC education. Transversal rationality strengthens dialogic communication that is attentive to Otherness and cultural differences. Transversal rationality at the center of a critical constructive praxis in IMC aligns the pedagogical experience with

consciousness, time, space, place, and rhetorical competence in a communal environment that cares for Otherness. It highlights the moral face of the teaching act built around mutual acknowledgment. It elevates IMC education from a practice-based discipline toward a sacred interaction of the universal and particular rooted in Western philosophy. A critical constructive pedagogy for IMC values responsiveness, self-criticism, and open-mindedness, all obligated to Otherness.

## **Chapter 6**

### **Conclusion**

Studying IMC as a discourse is an idea born from a faith in the potential of the discursive analysis within critical communication ethics. Validating integration acknowledges the complex nature of studying IMC, implying a contradiction between its conceptual problems and its professed goal to strive for a humanistic market experience. One major conceptual issue lying at the center of IMC involves a solid identification of the theory and the notion of integration within. This conceptual dilemma around defining IMC has been an issue in the literature since the 1990s. It is a problem that keeps IMC from moving forward toward expanding ethical discussions. Only Schultz and Schultz have taken the path toward IMC as a brand communication. They elevated the mere tactical idea of combining marketing communication tools for better promotional achievements more toward a strategic and a firm wide and corporate perspective. Marketplace fragmentation has reflected on the practical side of IMC. Integration since then has been popularized as a combination of the tools of the promotion mix, including advertising and public relations, instead as a holistic corporate communication strategy.

In 1996, Schultz said that integration is a truth, and later in 2020 he attached it to forming the primacy of the human consumer in IMC. However, what makes integration problematic is the fragmented discursive analysis around the core of its identity as a concept and its ethical dimensions. The technicality of doing integration separates tactical and strategic levels in a way that blurs integration as a holistic monitor of ethical, humanistic, and economic dimensions. This division translates in global branding practices. Influential Western brands like Netflix or F1 struggle when they represent cultural differences and Otherness. Racism, stereotypes, and claims that universal truth is known and acceptable everywhere around the world appear in advertising,

mediated content, and public relations campaigns. As a result, an actualization of integration as a capitalistic commodity that obeys market decisions neglects ethical concerns in preparing and developing IMC programs.

Rethinking and finding a place for an ethical version of integration in IMC public discourse is an important contribution to IMC studies. Integration as a perception management strategy that responds to the needs of the contemporary historical moment is inescapable. With all the possibilities that modern technology is offering, advertising, promoting, and selling, a classic model of branding and marketing becomes a challenge to implement. Studying IMC as a form of public discourse allows the rhetorical power within the humanistic values and norms to emerge. It also allows thinking of cultural boundaries and differences as materials that represent legitimate and genuine cultural activities. The rhetorical tradition within IMC studies (Christensen et al., *Corporate Communications*; Cornelissen; Persuit) and within philosophy of communication (Troup; Groom, “The Next Integration”) embraces contextualized, culturally relevant, and diversified opportunities for meaning making. Such a tradition resonates to how IMC as a set of post-structural practices and discourses is important to allowing qualitative methodologies to appear and challenge the linear positivist research sustaining IMC (Gould). Viewing the public sphere as constituted by symbolically rearranged experiences and relations becomes the first step in unpacking the abstractedness of qualitative studies with all its complexity, subjectivity, or resistance to measurability (Daymon and Holloway; Kliatchko).

Habermas, Said, and Schrag, on one side, and the problematic position of integration, on the other side, feed this discursive analysis. Said’s cultural criticism of textual and historical misrepresentation is the starting point that makes a humanistic version of integration possible. Habermas’s philosophy of the public sphere, the development of communicative rationality, and

the critique of cosmopolitanism enriches communication ethics and the universal-humanitarian approach. The three notions feed into a moral philosophy in which Habermas situates communal and communicative practices. Schrag's notion of transversal rationality brings together the implications from Said and Habermas into a practical pedagogical experience that is helpful for IMC as a traveling theory. IMC praxis ultimately can be viewed as a fulfillment of the original theory envisioned by Schultz and his colleagues—a human-based approach to the marketplace.

Said's cultural criticism of the colonial misrepresentation of the Orient is the starting point and an invitation to a humanistic and ethical version of integration. *Orientalism* "as a discourse" stretches Foucauldian discourse beyond power-controlled production of knowledge toward an awareness of the role of cultural symbols and Otherness in shaping public discourse. The "manifest Orientalism" beginning in the 1970s and affected by globalization and the technological revolution has consequences on commerce and communication. The most influential global brands, such as Netflix and F1, engage in a one-sided relationship driven by a capitalistic interpretation of cultural boundaries and moral values. They carry pictures of the imaginative Orient inherited from latent orientalism in sociological, linguistic, literary, and political reports. The critique of integration via Said's *Orientalism* envisions an ethical version with a solid Saidian argument for the roots of cultural bias represented by textual production. Seeing integration within the neocolonial context of the capitalistic hegemony of the global marketplace finds in Said's deliberate boundarylessness an invitation to prejudice-free intercultural interaction. This approach to integration has the ability to perform what Mohan Dutta calls a "communicative inversion" that would replace historical symbolic misrepresentations of the Other in public perception.



Said's academic and professional background in comparative literature shaped his "pedagogy of nomadism" and allowed him to explore Orientalism and culture through phenomenological hermeneutics, Marxism, poststructuralism, philology, and anti-imperialist discourses (Iskandar and Rustom 7). Such an exploration of nomadism appears again within his idea of "traveling theory" in which the human production of knowledge always has a moving and dynamic status (Said, *The World*). Said's training and professional practice in critical thinking manifests when he pursues discussions on humanism. His humanistic vision draws a balance between the rhetoric of emancipation aided by critical techniques and the pragmatism of exile, distinguishing him from other postcolonial theorists like Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Homi K. Bhabha (Kennedy). Said's tendency to explore worldly ideas becomes helpful to media literacy and to the role of vernaculars in shaping ideologies, cultures, and symbolic boundaries (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia). This is why Said's postcolonialism is important to a discipline like advertising. Fu's exploration of the racial identity and the racial other within advertising as the sphere of ideology shows how an integrated communication of man-made judgement can attend to a one-sided version of truth.

The intersection of Said and Habermas comes in the dimension of discursive analysis. Said's understanding of Foucauldian discourse as the representation of episteme within time, geography, politics, and society works as a form of validation. In order to validate a cultural claim or narrative, power and knowledge attend to the Hegelian dialectic of production and consumption. In Said's words, every produced representation of Otherness attends to potential consumption in a repeatedly epistemological structure. What is missing within this Saidian treatment of discourse is a reflection on the humanistic and ethical dimensions that Habermas provides through his discussion of discourse ethics. Said does not explore the Foucauldian

methodology that contains highly subjective notions like representation, power, and knowledge. The linguistic structure underpinning the discursive formation points to the fine line between a humanistic horizon of emancipation and the will to dominate without much elaboration on how that works in reality. That is how Foucault's discursive formation is implemented differently within linguistic studies, especially within "textually oriented discourse analysis" (TODA) (Fairclough 1992/2006). Within TODA, discourse chases the difference between object and subject, and between concepts and strategies in which the domains of knowledge follow specific rules.

Respecting, challenging, and reshaping cultural boundaries becomes the center of the ethical discussion inferred from Said's discourse. First, he explores integrated Orientalization of Otherness throughout different historical moments (*Orientalism*). Then, he explores the pedagogy of nomadism and the dynamic of traveling ideas and philosophies (*The World*). He also explores the continuous tension between culture, imperialism, and colonialism.

Accordingly, IMC discourse as an analysis inspired by the idea of colonization has three components: the medium, the scope of the medium, and the historical moment. Integration is the medium of IMC that allows it to do discursive analysis and to manage collective perception. The medium is the message (McLuhan), and the message is unified. The scope of the message is global, corporate, and cultural. From here appears the identification of the word "integration" as the act of bringing things together. Economic, cultural, religious, and political orientations are all important to consider in the branding enterprise. The historical moment is where relevancy comes into play. The historical moment monitors being both realistic and attentive to the Other. Said's version of liberating and decolonizing the communicative act comes in the form of contextualizing humanistic differences in which cosmopolitanism erases boundaries. A sense of

deliberate boundarylessness can spot the Western colonial connotations appearing within manifest capitalistic forms. Deliberate boundarylessness becomes important to shaping a humanistic version of integration that already suffers a shortage of cultural discussions (Gould; Grein and Gould; Gould et al.), and it creates the bridge to Habermas's discourse ethics carried by public sphere theory and communicative rationality.

Habermas's discourse ethics strengthens the moral pursuit of argumentation. Through understanding the dynamic of integration in the public sphere, Habermas conceptualizes the potential of the communicative act in leading conversation and argumentation. His perception of integration is linguistically rooted in the communicative act. Through social systems, language, and the ethics of argumentation behind the rational act appear cultural products and rituals. For Habermas, the action is the medium that should validate itself rationally before being considered moral. Some humanistic IMC studies realize this aspect of Habermasian philosophy especially when they combine it with the role of the rhetorical tradition. For example, Pursuit's utilization of Ciceronian rhetoric and Gerard Hauser's vernaculars of the public sphere are great extension of Habermas within IMC ethics and social media studies. Pursuit, Groom ("The Next Integration"), and Troup find a place for Habermas's discourse ethics within IMC as a public discourse in which ordinary people have access to public deliberation and argumentation.

Discourse ethics is an important Habermasian notion carried by communicative rationality in which the moral structure replaces religious-based structures (Habermas, *Volume 2*). Such a perspective strengthens the ability of moral philosophy to solidify social presuppositions. It strengthens the role of discursive socialization behind the extraction of rational validity claims. The tension between "discourse principles" and "moral principles" allow for acknowledgment and open-mindedness to emerge within communal relationships (Habermas,

*Between Facts*). Aided by a comprehensive rhetorical understanding, or what Habermas calls the “ideal speech situation,” discourse ethics can rise to an ontological level central to the means of human existence (Hyde, *The Life-Giving Gift*).

Ultimately, a deliberate and coercion-free communicative act allows difference and diversity to emerge. For Habermas, communication should allow systematically distorted communication to emerge through dialogue and communal interaction. The instrumentality of Habermas’s route to making meanings helps him find truth untouched by “projected consensus” (*Communicative Praxis* 61). Such a route appears from his systematic exploration of symbolically constituted relations and the norms of the rhetorical culture of the bourgeois public sphere. The relationship between rhetoric and reason within Habermas’s public sphere theory (Farrell; McKerrow) eventually allows him to notice the appearance of commodity fetishism, or the commodification of humanity, within *The Theory of Communicative Action*. The interplay of communication, ethics, and economy illustrates a discursive-rhetorical analysis in which the market is just a single representation of human behavior.

Habermas’s critical communication ethics centered on instrumental reasoning allows for a “procedural inclusion” to take place (Arnett et al., *Communication Ethics Literacy*). However, it has been challenged by lack of legitimacy because it is tied to and controlled by communicative competence and the use of language, which has been characterized as highly subjective (Lyotard; Schrag, *Communicative Praxis*). From here appears the intersections of Habermas and Foucault and Habermas and Said. When Habermas revisits the Kantian critique of reason, he aims for a modern version of cosmopolitanism theory that matches the needs of the contemporary historical moment. He envisions a form of democratic cosmopolitanism accessible through instrumental utilization of political freedom.

Communicative competence appears again, highlighting the role of discursive power and its ability to shape universal norms. It is a form of power that Said and Foucault direct toward domination and emancipation, production and consumption. Foucault's archeology traces power within the truth of the teller and the power of exclusion. Capitalism and disciplinary institutions use a discursive power to create systems of exclusion rooted in communicative competence and the use of language. Between the universal validation of moral claims (Habermas) and attentiveness to particular and situated cultural systems (Said) appears integration as problematic again. Seeing power sometimes as an obstacle to the production and distribution of knowledge and other times as a democratic form of domination makes doing integration on a global scale controversial.

Schrag's notion of transversal rationality comes to offer a critical constructive praxis that is specifically important to IMC pedagogy. Schrag's notion of praxis explores the means of public participation within the idea of the university carried by teachers, students, and IMC graduate and undergraduate programs. Through transversal rationality, Schrag creates a conceptual balance between the universal and the particular and between the criticism of power and the creativity of constructive alignment of difference and Otherness. The implications of reading Schrag in alignment with Habermas's discourse ethics and Said's discursive and cultural analysis are important to IMC education. Transversal rationality involves an acknowledgment of cultural particularity needed in IMC education. Transversal rationality aligns consciousness, time, space, place, and rhetorical competence within a communal environment that cares for Otherness and difference.

Schrag's transversality grounded in philosophy of communication offers a balance between language as an instrumental dimension underpinning discourse (Habermas) and

language as the realm of narrativity and contextuality (Said). As a result, the back and forth between discourse and cultural situatedness becomes a deliberate communicative labor. By being rooted in philosophy of communication, transversal rationality increases the awareness of the difference between consensus based on communicative competence and the potential of communicative competence while meeting diversity. Specifically, within the idea of the university, transversal rationality aids critical thinking needed in IMC pedagogy. John Henry Newman's idea of the university reflects on the potential of intellectual and professional training for IMC students (Groom, "The Next Integration"). The university understood as a community of learners represents the social status and the environmental challenges shaping any historical moment. It portrays sources of rational and critical inquiries as well as intellectual self-identification.

Transversal rationality in action translates into Arneson's notion of transversal awareness, underpinning an interplay of critical discernment, hermeneutic interpretation, and narrative articulation (*Communicative Engagement*). The pragmatics of social practices represented by those moments point to the minimal ethical standards need for a critical constructive pedagogy for IMC. When transversal rationality is viewed through such a lens, a communicative engagement of speech and action appears. Critical discernment as the realm of questions and answers and hermeneutic interpretation as the implication of the speaking subject are different forms of charging dialogic skills among students. To certain degrees, they both respond to the consequences of the commodification of humanity to which IMC practices attend.

A critical constructive pedagogy for IMC teaches students the needed critical and practical skills to explore different representations of moral struggles within global branding. Big brands release their promotional programs based on thorough and systematic corporate efforts

that do not seem to allow a moral struggle to emerge. However, the struggle appears when IMC practices are examined according to original IMC theoretical elements. IMC was meant to be a humanistic and consumer-based approach to marketing communication activities. Theorists aim for a humanistic and philosophically justified discipline, but global brands struggle when it comes to meeting, knowing, and representing the Other in mediated content. Branding promotes individualism (Kliatchko), “imperialist” ideas (Rose and Miller, “*Integrated Communications*”), and one-sided representations of Otherness. Something like Habermas’s social integration in which social, behavioral, and personal laws are contextualized within cultural narratives is neglected and dismissed. Habermas’s communication ethics allow the pragmatics of social integration to appear through argumentation and validity claims all through showing the legitimacy of truth and the resonance of that to the communicative setting. The convergence of the particular and the universal appears more necessary than ever before.

Studying IMC as a discourse within a critical constructive pedagogy through the works of Said, Habermas, and Schrag highlights the historical justifications behind the field’s emergence, development, and maturity. Such an approach focuses on the relevancy between different places and spaces where IMC has been practiced and taught. The critical constructive pedagogy emerging from an understanding of IMC as a discourse points to the Foucauldian postmodern deconstruction of power. It illustrates how philosophy of communication brings the text, the interpreter, and the historical moment into dialogue. A critical constructive praxis for IMC makes use of the corporeal/linguistic expressivity as an important case for IMC students to sharpen their critical thinking skills. Arneson says that a creative response involving acceptance, modification, and rejection of circulated meanings in a shared consciousness contributes to the shaping of the morality of the culture-sphere. Habermas’s critical communication ethics and

Said's humanistic criticism bring a case of communicative engagement between the lived-body (the corporate body) and the Other that are important to cultural, racial, and social liberation.

The critical constructive pedagogy for IMC presented in this dissertation centralizes two metaphors: discourse and integration. Discourse refers to linguistic concreteness within social unities, and it contains critical, moral, and communicative dimensions. The critical dimension appears with Said's examination of Orientalism as a discursive power. Habermas sculpts the moral dimension by giving discourse rational tools and validity claims. Habermas's social integration is a communicative act that transmits culturally stored knowledge, contextualizes norms in appropriate theoretical frameworks, and controls behaviors and personality structures. Finally, the communicative dimension of discourse appears when Schrag highlights its roots in the Saussurean distinction between *parole* and *langue*. Habermas's moral discourse, Said's cultural criticism, and Schrag's means of communicative discourse all provide a guidance for a critical communicative praxis for IMC

While exploring IMC as a discourse throughout this dissertation, the philosophical and critical meaning of the word "discourse" emerged. Schrag uses a linguistic philosophy of discourse to ground transversal rationality. Habermas conceptualizes discourse ethics through a set of communicative and rational rules. Foucault comes from a discussion of epistemological discourse to support his archeological-based critique of power that inspired Said. It is interesting to see how the exploration of the discourse of such an area, field, or inquiry offers an abundance of meanings beyond epistemological apparatuses. Discourse, here, becomes an independent form of identifying something (in this dissertation, IMC).

What inspired this dissertation in the first place was the difference between exploring *the discourse of something* and doing or studying *something as a discourse*. Understanding



something “as a discourse” is not possible without understanding the discourse of something. However, understanding something as a discourse releases the subject from focusing on the man-made contribution of that something. Instead, it shifts the focus to the balance between criticism and constructive creativity. This dissertation on IMC as a discourse is important to marketing communication studies because it contributes to the ethical side of the literature that lacks philosophical discussions. Furthermore, a critical constructive pedagogy is important to IMC education, and it increases the popularity of IMC studies and academic programs outside their Western origins based on solid philosophical and critical analysis.

## Works Cited

- Aaker, David. *Building Strong Brands*. The Free Press, 1996.
- Ahmad, Ala'Eddin Mohammad Khalaf. "Integrated Marketing Communication and Brand Image in Saudi Private Sector Hospitals: An Empirical Investigation." *International Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 11, no. 11, 2016, pp. 94–100,
- Arato, Andrew. "Critical Sociology and Authoritarian State Socialism." *Habermas: Critical Debates*, edited by John B. Thompson and David Held, Macmillan Press, 1982, pp. ##–##.
- Arens, Edmund. "Discourse Ethics and Its Relevance for Communication and Media Ethics." *Communication Ethics and Universal Values*, edited by Clifford Christians and Michael Traber, Sage Publications, 1997.
- Aristotle., et al. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Arneson, Pat. *Communicative Engagement and Social Liberation*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2014.
- . *Perspectives on Philosophy of Communication*. Purdue University Press, 2007.
- Arnett, Ronald C. *Communication and Community: Implications of Martin Buber's Dialogue*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1986.
- . *Communication Ethics in Dark Times: Hannah Arendt's Rhetoric of Warning and Hope*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2013.
- . *Dialogic Confession: Bonhoeffer's Rhetoric of Responsibility*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2005.
- . "Defining Philosophy of Communication: Difference and Identity." *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2010, pp. 57–62.

- . *Levinas's Rhetorical Demand: The Unending Obligation of Communication Ethics*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2017.
- . "The Practical Philosophy of Communication Ethics and Free Speech as the Foundation for Speech Communication." *Communication Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 3, Summer 1990, pp. 208–17.
- . "The Responsive 'I': Levinas's Derivative Argument." *Argumentation and Advocacy*, vol. 40, no. 39, 2003.
- . "Walking the Humanities into the Marketplace: A Communicative Call." *Business Education and Training: A Value-Laden Process*, edited by Samuel Natale and Anthony Libertella. University Press of America, 2003, pp. 176–89.
- Arnett, Ronald C., and Pat Arneson. *Dialogic Civility in a Cynical Age: Community, Hope and Interpersonal Relationships*. State University of New York, 1999.
- Arnett, Ronald C., and François Cooren. *Dialogic Ethics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018.
- Arnett, Ronald C., and Janie M. Harden Fritz. "Departmental Excellence: Constituencies in Tension." *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, vol. 28, no. 1, Jan. 1999, pp. 19–26.
- Arnett, Ronald C., and Annette M. Holba. *An Overture to Philosophy of Communication: The Carrier of Meaning*. Peter Lang, 2012.
- Arnett, Ronald C., et al. "Communication Ethics: The Dialogic Turn." *Review of Communication*, vol. 6, no. 1/2, Jan. 2006, pp. 62–92.
- . *Communication Ethics Literacy: Dialogue and Difference*. Sage Publications, 2009.

---. *Corporate Communication Crisis Leadership: Advocacy and Ethics*. Business Expert Press, 2017.

Ashcroft, Bill. "Representation and Liberation: From Orientalism to the Palestinian Crisis."

*Edward Said: A Legacy of Emancipation and Representation*, edited by Adel Iskandar and Hakem Rustom, University of California Press, 2010, pp. 291-303.

Ashcroft, Bill, and Pal Ahluwalia. *Edward Said*. Routledge, 2001.

Ashcroft, Bill, and Hussein Kadhim. *Edward Said and the Post-Colonial*. Nova Science Publishers, 2001.

Aune, James Arnt. "'Only Connect': Between Morality and Ethics in Habermas' Communication Theory." *Communication Theory (1050-3293)*, vol. 17, no. 4, Nov. 2007, pp. 340-47.

Baldinger, Allan. "Integrated Communication and Measurement: The Case for Multiple Measures." *Integrated Communication: Synergy of Persuasive Voices*, edited by Esther Thorson and Jeri Moore, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996.

Bartels, Robert. *The Development of Marketing Thought*. R.D. Irwin, 1962.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals*. Polity Press, 1987.

Beck, Ulrich. *The Cosmopolitan Vision*. Polity Press. 2006.

Benhabib, Seyla. *Situating the Self: Gender, Community, and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*. Routledg, 1992.

Bernays, Edward. *Crystallizing Public Opinion*. Ig Publishing, 2011.

"Best Global Brands 2021." *Interbrand*, <https://interbrand.com/thinking/best-global-brands-2021-download/>

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge Classics, 1994.

- Bourenane, Abderrahmene. "Authenticity and Discourses in Aladdin (1992)." *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research*, vol. 13, no. 2, Nov. 2020, pp. 235–50.
- Bracci, Sharon L. "A Conversation about Communication Ethics with Sharon L. Bracci." *Exploring Communication Ethics: Interviews with influential scholars in the Field*, edited by Pat Arneson. Peter Lang, 2007, pp. ##–##.
- Bryce, Derek. "The Absence of Ottoman, Islamic Europe in Edward W. Said's Orientalism." *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 30, no. 1, Jan. 2013, pp. 99–121.
- Buhmann, Alexander, et al. "Connecting the Dots: A Bibliometric Review of Habermasian Theory in Public Relations Research." *Journal of Communication Management*, vol. 23, no. 4, Oct. 2019, pp. 444–67.
- Burnett, Stephen. "Reflections on Becoming a Great Marketing Organization." *Kellogg on Integrated Marketing*, edited by Iacobucci Dawn and Bobby Calder, Wiley, 2003, pp. ##–##.
- Carr, John. "Archeology and Genealogy." *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory*, edited by Stephen Littlejohn and Karen A. Foss, University of New Mexico, 2009.
- Carroll, Robert A. *Preparing Public Relations and Advertising Students for the 21st Century: A Case Study*. Department of Communications, University of Southern Indiana, 2000.
- Caywood, Clarke, and Raymond Ewing. "IMC: A New Master's Degree Concept." *Public Relations Review*, vol. 17, no. 3, 1991, pp. 237–44.
- Cheney, George, et al. *Handbook of Communication Ethics*. Routledge, 2011.
- . *Organizational Communication in an Age of Globalization: Issues, Reflections, Practices*. Waveland Press, 2011.

- Chesebro, James W. "A Construct for Assessing Ethics in Communication." *Central States Speech Journal*, vol. 20, Summer 1969, pp. 104–14.
- Chesebro, James W., and David T. McMahan. "Media Constructions of Mass Murder-Suicides as Drama: *The New York Times*' Symbolic Construction of Mass Murder-Suicides." *Communication Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 4, Nov. 2006, pp. 407–25.
- Christensen, Lars Thøger, et al. *Corporate Communications: Convention, Complexity, and Critique*. Sage Publications, 2008.
- . "Integrated Marketing Communication and Postmodernity: An Odd Couple?" *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2005, pp. 156–67.
- Cooren, François. "Toward Another Ideal Speech Situation: A Critique of Habermas' Reinterpretation of Speech Act Theory." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 86, no. 3, Aug. 2000, pp. 295–317.
- Cornelissen, Joep P. "Integrated Marketing Communication and the Language of Marketing Development." *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2001, pp. 483–98.
- Cornelissen, Joep P., and Andrew R. Lock. "Theoretical Concept or Management Fashion? Examining the Significance of IMC." *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 40, no. 5, 2000, pp. 7–15.
- Creedon, Pam, and Mai Al-Khaja. "An Overview of Middle East Public Relations Practice, Education, and Research from Isolation to Globalization." *Journal of Public Relations Research*, vol. 31, no. 3/4, July 2019, pp. 84–96.
- Daymon, Christine and Immy Holloway. *Qualitative Research Methods in Public Relations and Marketing Communications*. Routledge, 2002/2011.

- Deetz, Stanley. *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization: Developments in Communication and the Politics of Everyday Life*. State University of New York, 1992.
- Deetz, Stanley, et al. “Communicative Praxis and Collective Decision Making: From Phenomenology to the Politics of Experience to Dialogic Constitutive Practices.” *Experiences between Philosophy and Communication: Engaging the Philosophical Contributions of Calvin O. Schrag*, edited by Ramsey E. Eamsey and David Miller, State University of New York Press, 2003, pp. 55-72
- Dirks, Nicholas. “Edward Said and Anthropology.” *Edward Said: A Legacy of Emancipation and Representation*, edited by Adel Iskandar and Hakem Rustom, University of California Press, 2010, pp. 86-101
- DiTomaso, Nancy, et al. “Structure, Relationships, and Community Responsibility.” *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2003, pp. 143–50. 2003. doi: 10.1177/0893318903253447
- Delanty, Gerard. “Habermas and Occidental Rationalism: The Politics of Identity, Social Learning, and the Cultural Limits of Moral Universalism.” *Sociological Theory*, vol. 15, no. 1, Mar. 1997, pp. 30–59.
- Dodd, Steve. “Understanding The Various Attitudes on Consumer Privacy and Security.” *Journal of Integration Marketing Communication*. vol. 1. pp. 38-39. 2016.
- “Dubai Lynx 2022.” *Dubai Lynx*, 2022, <https://www.dubailynx.com/awards/integrated#/>.
- Duncan, Thomas R., and Stephen E. Everett. “Client Perceptions of Integrated Marketing Communications.” *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 33, no. 3, May 1993, pp. 30–39.
- Duncan, Tom, and Sandra E. Moriarty. “A Communication-Based Marketing Model for Managing Relationships.” *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 62, no. 2, Apr. 1998, pp. 1–13.

- Dutta, Mohan. "A Postcolonial Critique of Public Relations." *In The Routledge Handbook of Critical Public Relations*. Edited by Jacquie L'Etang et al. Routledge, 2016
- Dyer, Gillian. *Advertising as Communication*. Routledge, 1982.
- Eagle, Lynne, et al. "Insights into Interpreting Integrated Marketing Communications: A Two Nation Qualitative Comparison." *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 41, no. 7/8, July 2007, pp. 956–70.
- . "Perceptions of Integrated Marketing Communications among Marketers & Ad Agency Executives in New Zealand." *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 18, no. 1, Feb. 1999, pp. 89–119.
- Echchaibi, Nabil. "Who Speaks for the Arab World?" *Media Development*, vol. 54, no. 2, May 2007, pp. 11–14.
- Erdoğan, Bayram, Z. and Tolga Torun. "The Effects of Marcoms and Social Interaction through Virtual Communities on Consumer-Based Brand Equity." *Integrated Communications in the Postmodern Era*, edited by Philip J. Kitchen and Ebru Uzunoğlu, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, pp. 118-150.
- Ewen, Stuart. *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*. Basic Books, 2001.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press, 1992/2006.
- Farrell, Thomas. *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*. Yale University Press, 1993.
- Fine, Robert, and Will Smith. "Jürgen Habermas's Theory of Cosmopolitanism." *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical & Democratic Theory*, vol. 10, no. 4, Dec. 2003, pp. 469–87.
- Finlayson, James G. *Habermas: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2005.



- Firat, A. Fuat, and Alladi Venkatesh. "Liberatory Postmodernism and the Reenchantment of Consumption." *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 22, no. 3, Dec. 1995, pp. 239–67.
- Firat, A. Fuat, et al. "Marketing in a Postmodern World." *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 29, no. 1, Jan. 1995, pp. 40–56.
- Follett, Mary P. *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. Edited by Metcalf and L. Urwick. Pitman, 1941.
- "Formula 1 – Unleashed." *Wieden + Kennedy*, <https://wklondon.com/work/formula-1/>. Accessed 30 Mar. 2022.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith, Pantheon, 2002.
- . *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Pantheon, 1977.
- Frentz, Thomas S. "Rhetorical Conversation, Time, and Moral Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 71, no. 1, Feb. 1985, pp. 1–18.
- Friedman, Thomas, L. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. Anchor Books, 2000.
- Fu, Linda. *Advertising and Race: Global Phenomenon, Historical Challenges, and Visual Strategies*. Peter Lang, 2014.
- Gonring, Matthew P. "Putting Integrated Marketing Communications to Work Today." *Public Relations Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 3, Fall 1994, pp. 45–48.
- Goodnight, Thomas. "The Engagements of Communication: Jürgen Habermas on Discourse, Critical Reason, and Controversy." *Perspectives on Philosophy of Communication*, edited by Pat Arneson, Purdue University Press, 2007.

- Gould, Stephen. "IMC As Theory and As a Poststructural Set of Practices and Discourses: A Continuously Evolving Paradigm Shift." *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 44, no. 1, Mar. 2004, pp. 66–70.
- Gould, Stephen, et al. "Globally Integrated Marketing Communications: A Study of U.S.-Based, Multinational Advertising Agency Executives' Perception and Practices." *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1999, pp. 7–20.
- Grein, Andreas and Stephen J. Gould. "Globally Integration Marketing Communications." *Journal of Marketing Communications*. 2,3 (1996): 141-58.
- Griffin, W.Glenn, and Yorgo Pasadeos. "The Impact of IMC on Advertising and Public Relations Education." *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, vol. 53, no. 2, Summer 1998, pp. 4–18.
- Groom, Alyssa, S. "Integrated Marketing Communication Anticipating the 'Age of Engage.'" *Communication Research Trends*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2008, pp. 3–19.
- . "The Next Integration: IMC and the Field of Communication." *Review of Communication*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2011, pp. 145–60.
- Gunson, Darryl, and Chik Collins. "From the *I* to the *We*: Discourse, Ethics, Identity and the Pragmatics of Partnership in the West of Scotland." *Communication Theory*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1997, pp. 277–300.
- Haas, Tanni. "Public Relations between Universality and Particularity: Toward a Moral-Philosophical Conception of Public Relations Ethics." *Handbook of Public Relations*, edited by Robert Heath. Sage Publications, 2001.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. MIT Press, 1996.

- . *Legitimation Crisis*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy, Beacon Press, 1973.
- . *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*. Translated, edited, and with an introduction by Max Pensky, MIT Press, 2001.
- . *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. MIT Press, 1962/1991.
- . *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and The Rationalization of Society*. Beacon Press, 1984.
- . *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Beacon Press, 1987.
- Hafez, Sabry. "Edward Said in Contemporary Arabic Culture." *Edward Said: A Legacy of Emancipation and Representation*, edited by Adel Iskandar and Hakem Rustom. University of California Press, 2010, pp. 170-190
- Hall, Emma. "Year after Arab Spring, Digital, Social Media Shape Region's Rebirth." *Advertising Age*, vol. 83, no. 24, June 2012, p. 10.
- "Hamilton: I Am Not Comfortable Racing in Saudi Arabia; 'Our Sport Must Do More to Force Change.'" *Times*, 3 Dec. 2021.
- "Hamilton Uneasy about Saudi Race." *Daily Mail*, 3 Dec. 2021, p. 47.
- Hastings, Gerard, et al. "Fear Appeals in Social Marketing Strategic and Ethical Reasons for Concern." *Psychology & Marketing*, vol. 21, no. 11, Nov. 2004, pp. 961–86.
- <https://www.libertymedia.com/investors/financial-information/sec-filings/content/0001558370-22-007569/0001558370-22-007569.pdf>.
- Hauser, Gerard. *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres*. University of South Carolina Press, 1999.

- Heugens, Pursey P. M. A. R. "Fame & Fortune: How Successful Companies Build Winning Reputations (Book)." *Corporate Reputation Review*, vol. 6, no. 4, Winter 2004, pp. 390–95.
- Honneth, Axel, and Hans Joas. *Communicative Action: Essays on Jürgen Habermas's The Theory of Communicative Action*. MIT Press, 1991.
- Hussein, Abdirahman A. "A New 'Copernican' Revolution: Said's Critique of Metaphysics and Theology." *Edward Said: A Legacy of Emancipation and Representation*, edited by Adel Iskandar and Hakem Rustom, University of California Press, 2010.
- Hyde, Michael J. "Ethics, Rhetoric, and Discourse." *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*, edited by George Cheney et al., Taylor and Francis, 2011, pp. 31-44.
- . *The Life-Giving Gift of Acknowledgment: A Philosophical and Rhetorical Inquiry*. Purdue University Press, 2006.
- Iacobucci, Dawn, and Calder, Bobby. "Overview of Kellogg on Integrated Marketing." *Kellogg on Integrated Marketing*, edited by Dawn Iacobucci and Bobby J. Calder. John Wiley & Sons, 2003, pp. 1–5.
- Ijsseling, Samuel. *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Conflict: An Historical Survey*. MARTINUS NIJH, 1976.
- Iskandar, Adel, and Hakem Rustom. *Edward Said: A Legacy of Emancipation and Representation*. University of California Press, 2010.
- Jardine, Alexandra. "What to Expect at Virtual Cannes: Lions Chair Philip Thomas Discusses Zoom Juries, Digital Networking and 'Deep Dives' into the Work." *Advertising Age*, vol. 92, no. 5, Apr. 2021, p. 7.

- Jensen, John Vernon. *Ethical Issues in the Communication Process*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 1997.
- Johansen, Trine Susanne, and Sophie Esmann Andersen. "Co-Creating ONE: Rethinking Integration within Communication." *Corporate Communications*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2012, pp. 272–88.
- Johnstone, Christopher Lyle. "Ethics, Wisdom, and the Mission of Contemporary Rhetoric: The Realization of Human Being." *Central States Speech Journal*, vol. 32, no. 3, Sept. 1981, pp. 177–88.
- Kamali-Chirani, Fatemeh. "Public Relations in the Gulf Cooperation Council Countries: An Arab Perspective." *International Journal of Communication*, Sept. 2021, p. 4310.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophic Essay (1795)*. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1903.
- Karolak, Hannah. "Philosophy of Communication Ethics: Scholarship Beyond the One and the Other." *Review of Communication*, vol. 15, no. 4, Oct. 2015, pp. 316–31.
- Karsaklian, Eliane. "Does Your Advertising Really Motivate Consumers To Buy Your Ethical Products?" *Journal of Integrated Marketing Communication*, vol.1, 2016, pp. 28-29.
- Kennedy, Valerie. *Edward Said: A Critical Introduction*. Polit Press, 2000.
- Kerr, Gayle. "Apples, Oranges and Fruit Salad: A Delphi Study of the IMC Educational Mix." *Journal of Marketing Communications*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2009, pp. 119–137.
- Kerr, Gayle, and Louise Kelly. "IMC Education and Digital Disruption." *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 51, no. 3, Mar. 2017, pp. 406–20.

- Kerr, Gayle, and Charles Patti. "Strategic IMC: From Abstract Concept to Marketing Management Tool." *Journal of Marketing Communications*, vol. 21, no. 5, Oct. 2015, pp. 317–39.
- Kitchen, Philip J. "In Memory of Don E. Schultz." *Journal of Marketing Communications*, vol. 26, no. 6, Sept. 2020, pp. 571–74.
- . *The Future of Marketing: Critical 21st-Century Perspectives*. Palgrave, 2003.
- . *The Rhetoric and Reality of Marketing: An International Managerial Approach*. Palgrave, 2003.
- Kitchen, Philip J., and Patrick De Pelsmacker. *Integrated Marketing Communications: A Primer*. Routledge, 2004.
- Kitchen, Philip J., and Don E. Schultz. "IMC: New Horizon/False Dawn for a Marketplace in Turmoil?" *Journal of Marketing Communications*, vol. 15, no. 2/3, Apr. 2009, pp. 197–204.
- . *Raising the Corporate Umbrella*. Palgrave, 2001.
- Kitchen, Philip J., and Marwa Tourky. "Integrated Marketing Communications: A Contextual International Advertising Approach." *Integrated Communications in the Postmodern Era*, edited by Philip J. Kitchen and Ebru Uzunoğlu, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, pp. 19–48.
- Kitchen, Philip J., and Ebru Uzunoglu. *Integrated Communications in the Postmodern Era*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Kitchen, Philip J., et al. "The Emergence of IMC: A Theoretical Perspective." *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 44, no. 1, Mar. 2004, pp. 19–30.
- . "Integrated Marketing Communications: Practice Leads Theory." *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2008, pp. 531–46.

- Kliatchko, Jerry. *IMC: Putting the Human Consumer at the Core*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2020.
- Kliatchko, Jerry, and Don E. Schultz. "Twenty Years of IMC: A Study of CEO and CMO Perspectives 373 in the Asia-Pacific Region." *International Journal of Advertising: The Quarterly Review of Marketing Communications*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2014, pp. 373–90.
- Langsdorf, Lenore. "Epistemology, Tropology, Hermeneutics, and the 'Essence of Language.'" *Experiences between Philosophy and Communication: Engaging the Philosophical Contributions of Calvin O. Schrag*, edited by Ramsey E. Eamsey and David Miller, State University of New York Press, 2003, pp. 169-190
- Lanigan, Richard L. "The Rhetoric of Discourse: Chiasm and Dialogue in Communicology." *Dialogic Ethics*, edited by Ronald C. Arnett and François Cooren, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018.
- Lee, Wei-Na. "Exploring the Role of Culture in Advertising: Resolving Persistent Issues and Responding to Changes." *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 48, no. 1, Jan. 2019, pp. 115–25.
- Le Ha, Phan, and Osman Z. Barnawi. "Where English, Neoliberalism, Desire and Internationalization Are Alive and Kicking: Higher Education in Saudi Arabia Today." *Language & Education: An International Journal*, vol. 29, no. 6, Nov. 2015, pp. 545–65.
- Leichty, Greg. "The Cultural Tribes of Public Relations." *Journal of Public Relations Research*, vol. 15, no. 4, Oct. 2003, pp. 277–304.
- Levina, Svetlana Aleksandrovna. "Integrated Marketing Communications Application in the Education Market." *Управленческое Консультирование*, no. 6, Apr. 2018, pp. 173–81.
- Lipari, Lisbeth. "Listening Otherwise: The Voice of Ethics." *International Journal of Listening*, vol. 23, no. 1, Feb. 2009, pp. 44–59.

- Littlejohn, Stephen W., and Karen A. Foss. *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory*. University of New Mexico, 2009.
- Lloyd, C. "How Leading Advertising Agency Media Directors View Integrated Communication: A Qualitative Study of Integrated Communications and the Media Planning Process." *Integrated Communication: Synergy of Persuasive Voices*, edited by Esther Thorson and Jeri Moore, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1996, pp. 35–48.
- Love, Nancy. "What's Left of Marx?" *The Cambridge Companion to Habermas*, edited by Stephen K. White, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition*. University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *God, Philosophy, Universities: A Selective History of the Catholic Philosophical Tradition*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009.
- . *A Short History of Ethics: A History of Moral Philosophy from the Homeric Age to the Twentieth Century*. Routledge, 1988.
- Marsden, George M. *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief*. 1994. Print.
- Mathew, Seeger, and Timothy Kuhn. "Communication Ethics and Organizational Contexts: Divergent Values and Moral Puzzles." *Handbook of Communication Ethics*, edited by George Cheney et al, Routledge, 2011.
- Mao, Sihui. "A Fabulous Speck: Oriental Imaginaries of Macao as the Veiled Other in Post-WWII Western Cinema." *Intercultural Communication Studies*, vol. 25, no. 1, June 2016, pp. 110–32.



- Massad, Joseph. "Affiliating with Edward Said." *Edward Said: A Legacy of Emancipation and Representation*, edited by Adel Iskandar and Hakem Rustom, University of California Press, 2010.
- . "The Intellectual Life of Edward Said." *Journal of Palestine Studies*, vol. 33, no. 3, 2004, pp. 7–22.
- McCarthy, Thomas. *The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas*. The MIT Press, 1985.
- McKerrow, Raymie. "Limitations of the Public Sphere: The Repressive Voice of Modernity." *Experiences between Philosophy and Communication: Engaging the Philosophical Contributions of Calvin O. Schrag*, edited by Ramsey E. Eamsey and David Miller, State University of New York Press, 2003, pp. 73-88
- McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Gingko Press, 2003.
- Muller, Jerry. *The Mind and the Market: Capitalism in Western Thought*. Anchor, 2002.
- Mumby, Dennis. "Power and Ethics." *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*, edited by George Cheney et al, Routledge, 2011, pp. 166–89.
- Munshi, Debashish, et al. "Decolonizing Communication Ethics: A Framework for Communicating *Otherwise*." *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*, edited by George Cheney et al., Routledge, 2011.
- Newman, John Henry. *The Idea of a University Defined*. University of Notre Dame Press, 1873.
- Nill, Alexander, and John Schibrowsky. "Research on Marketing Ethics: A Systematic Review of the Literature." *Journal of Macromarketing*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2007, pp. 256–73.
- Ogilvy, David. *Ogilvy on Advertising*. Vintage Books, 1983.
- Okulska, Urszula. "The Ethics of Intercultural Dialogue: Reconciliation Discourse in John Paul II's Pontifical Correspondence." *Dialogic Civility in a Cynical Age: Community, Hope*

- and Interpersonal Relationships*, edited by Ronald C. Arnett and Pat Arneson, State University of New York, 1999.
- Ottmann, Henning. "Cognitive Interests and Self-Reflection." *Habermas: Critical Debates*, edited by John B. Thompson and David Held, Macmillan Press, 1982.
- Ots, Mary, and Gergely G. Nyilasy. "Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC): Why Does It Fail?" *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 55, no. 2, 1988/2017, pp. 132–45.
- Outhwaite, William. *Habermas: A Critical Introduction*. Polity Press, 2009.
- Palmer, Richard E. *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger and Gadamer*. Northwestern University Press, 1969.
- Peltier, James W., et al. "Interactive Integrated Marketing Communication: Combining the Power of IMC, the New Media and Database Marketing." *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2003, pp. 93–115.
- Percy, Larry. *Strategic Integrated Marketing Communications: Theory and Practice*. Elsevier, 2008.
- Persuit, Jeanne. *Integrated Marketing Communication and Social Media: A Rhetorical Approach*. Lexington Books, 2013.
- Peterson, Lisa A., and Paul Wang. "Integrated Marketing Communication: Examining Planning and Executional Considerations." *Integrated Communication: Synergy of Persuasive Voices*, edited by Esther Thorson and Jeri Moore, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1996, pp. 153–66.
- Pietri, Paul H. "Organizational Communication: The Pioneers." *Journal of Business Communication*, vol. 11, no. 4, Summer 1974, pp. 3–6.
- Pilotta, Joseph J., and Don Schultz. "Simultaneous Media Experience and Synesthesia." *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 45, no. 1, Mar. 2005, pp. 19–26.

- Podnar, Klement, and Urša Golob. "Customer Engagement—Fad or the Real McCoy? The Attempt of IMC Paradigm Shift via Online Media." *Integrated Communications in the Postmodern Era*, edited by Philip J. Kitchen and Ebru Uzunoğlu, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, pp. 100-117
- Porcu, Lucia, et al. "Do Adhocracy and Market Cultures Facilitate Firm-Wide Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC)?" *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 36, no. 1, Jan. 2017, pp. 121–41.
- Postman, Neil. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. Penguin Books, 1985.
- Prasad, Anshuman, and Raza Mir. "Digging Deep for Meaning: A Critical Hermeneutic Analysis of CEO Letters to Shareholders in the Oil Industry." *Journal of Business Communication*, vol. 39, no. 1, Jan. 2002, pp. 92–116.
- Radford, Gary P. *On the Philosophy of Communication: Wadsworth Philosophical Topics*. Cengage Learning, 2005.
- Ramsey, Ramsey E., and David Miller. *Experiences between Philosophy and Communication: Engaging the Philosophical Contributions of Calvin O. Schrag*, State University of New York Press, 2003, pp. 3-52
- Rebel, Henrik. "Towards a Metaphorical Theory of Public Relations." *Public Relations Research: An International Perspective*, edited by Danny Moss, Toby MacManus, and Dejan Vercic, International Thomson Business Press, 1997.
- Reid, Mike. "Performance Auditing of Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) Actions and Outcomes." *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 34, no. 4, Dec. 2005, pp. 41–54.

- Rodgers, James. "Journalism, Separation and Independence: Newspaper Coverage of the End of the British Mandate for Palestine, 1948." *Journalism*, vol. 20, no. 11, Nov. 2019, pp. 1497–512.
- Rose, Patricia B., and Debra A. Miller. "Integrated Communications and Practitioners' Perceived Needs." *Journalism Educator*, vol. 48, no. 1, Spring 1993, pp. 20–27.
- . "Merging Advertising and PR: Integrated Marketing Communications." *Journalism Educator*, vol. 49, no. 2, Summer 1994, pp. 52–63.
- Roznowski, JoAnn, et al. "Perceptions of IMC education among Practitioners." *Journal of Advertising Education*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2004, pp. 48–55.
- Said, Edward. *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. Penguin Books, 1997.
- . *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books, 1994.
- . "Interview: Edward W. Said." *Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism*, vol. 6, no. 3, 1976, pp. 30–47.
- . *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1978/2003.
- . *Out of Place: A Memoir*. Vintage Books. 2000. Print.
- . *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Schaefer, Zachary A., et al. "Economic Justice and Communication Ethics: Considering Multiple Points of Intersection." *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*, edited by George Cheney et al., Taylor and Francis, 2011, pp. 436-456.
- Schmidt, James. "Habermas and Foucault." *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity*, edited by Maurizio Passerin d'Entreves and Seyla Benhabib, MIT Press, 1997, pp. 147-171.

- Schrag, Calvin O. *Convergence amidst Difference: Philosophical Conversations across National Boundaries*. State University of New York Press, 2004.
- . *The Communicative Praxis and the Space of Subjectivity*. University of Indiana Press, 1986.
- . "The Idea of the University and the Communication of Knowledge in a Technological Age." *Communication Philosophy and the Technological Age*, edited by Michael J. Hyde, University of Alabama Press, 1982.
- . *The Resources of Rationality: A Response to the Postmodern Challenge*. Indiana University Press, 1992.
- . *The Self after Postmodernity*. Yale University Press, 1997.
- Schultz, Don. "Redesigning Marketing to Fit a Different Marketplace." *The Future of Marketing: Critical 21st-Century Perspectives*, edited by Philip Kitchen, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003, pp. 12–40.
- . *The Evolution of Integration Marketing Communications*. Routledge, 2011.
- . "The Inevitability of Integrated Communications." *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 37, no. 3, Nov. 1996, 139–46.
- Schultz, Don, and Heidi Schultz. *IMC, The Next Integration: Five Steps for Delivering Value and Measuring Returns Using Marketing Communication*. Prince, 2004.
- Schultz, Don, et al. *Essentials of Advertising Strategy*. NTC Business Books, 1996.
- . *Integrated Marketing Communications: Putting It Together and Making It Work*. NTC Books, 1993.
- . *The Evolution of Integration Marketing Communications: A Customer-Driven Marketplace*. Routledge, 2011.

- . *The New Marketing Paradigm: Integrated Marketing Communications*. NTC Business Books, 1994.
- Seeger, Matthew, and Timothy Kuhn. "Communication Ethics and Organizational Contexts: Divergent Values and Moral Puzzles." *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*, edited by George Cheney et al., Routledge, 2011, pp. ##-##.
- Šerić, Maja. "Content Analysis of the Empirical Research on IMC from 2000 to 2015." *Journal of Marketing Communications*, vol. 24, no. 7, Nov. 2018, pp. 647–85.
- Simonson, Peter, et al. *The Handbook of Communication History*. Routledge, 2013.
- Skinner, Dan. "A Changing Approach to Social Platforms." *Journal of IMC*, vol. 1, 2018, pp. 28.
- "Statement of Commitment to Respect for Human Rights." *Formula One World Championship Limited*, <https://www.formula1.com/en/toolbar/statement-of-commitment-to-respect-for-human-rights.html>. Accessed 10 Oct. 2022.
- Stuhlfaut, Mark W., and Mike Farrell. "Pedagogic Cacophony: The Teaching of Ethical, Legal, and Societal Issues in Advertising Education." *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, vol. 64, no. 2, Summer 2009, pp. 173–90.
- Swain, William N. "Perceptions of IMC after a Decade of Development: Who's at the
- Tafesse, Wondwesen, and Philip J. Kitchen. "IMC—An Integrative Review." *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 36, no. 2, Mar. 2017, pp. 210–26.
- Thorson, Esther, and Jeri Moore. *Integrated Communication: Synergy of Persuasive Voices*. Psychology Press, 1996.
- Torp, Simon. "Integrated Communications: From One Look to Normative Consistency." *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2009, pp. 190–206.

- Troup, Calvin L. "Ordinary People Can Reason: A Rhetorical Case for Including Vernacular Voices in Ethical." *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 87, no. 4, 2009, pp. 441–53.
- Trujillo, Nick, and Elizabeth L. Toth. "Organizational Perspectives for Public Relations Research and Practice." *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1987, pp. 199–281.
- Usunier, Jean-Claude, and Julie Ann Lee. *Marketing Across Cultures*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Prentice Hall, 1992/2005.
- Valcke, Peggy, and Marieke Lenaerts. "Who's Author, Editor and Publisher in User-Generated Content? Applying Traditional Media Concepts to UGC Providers." *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, vol. 24, no. 1, Mar. 2010, pp. 119–31.
- Van Riel, Cees, and Charles Fombrun. *Essentials of Corporate Communications: Implementing Practices for Effective Reputation Management*. Routledge, 2007.
- Vultee, Fred. "Jump Back Jack, Mohammed's Here." *Journalism Studies*, vol. 10, no. 5, Oct. 2009, pp. 623–38.
- Walker, Kent. "A Systematic Review of the Corporate Reputation Literature: Definition, Measurement, and Theory." *Corporate Reputation Review*, vol. 12, no. 4, Winter 2010, pp. 357–87.
- Wallulis, Jerald. "A New Semantics for the Philosophy of Religion." *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, vol. 55, no. 3, June 2004, pp. 155–69.
- Wightman, Ben. "Integrated Communications: Organization and Education." *Public Relations Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 2, Summer 1999, pp. 18–22.
- Zaharna, R. S. "Intercultural Communication and International Public Relations: Exploring Parallels." *Communication Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 1, Winter 2000, pp. 85–100.

---. "Understanding Cultural Preferences of Arab Communication Patterns." *Public Relations Review*, vol. 21, no. 3, Fall 1995, p. 241.

Zreik, Raef. "The Ethics of the Intellectual: Rereading Edward Said." *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, vol. 47, no. 1, Jan. 2021, pp. 130–48.

Zvobgo, Mabel, and T. C. Melewar. "Drivers of Globally Integrated Marketing Communications: A Review of Literature and Research Propositions." *Journal of Promotion Management*, vol. 17, no. 1, Jan. 2011, pp. 1–20.