# Research Diary

I. Lock “Explicating Communicative Organization-Stakeholder Relationships in the Digital Age: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda.” *Public Relations Review.*

**Search string development**

* Collaboration with librarian Stefano Giani
* Started off with initial search string covering 3 main concepts: relationship; digital; measurement:
	+ (relation\* OR relationship\*) AND (digital\* OR “big data” OR internet OR online OR technolog\* OR web\* PR “social media” OR cyber) AND (measure\* OR evaluat\* OR analy\* OR assess\*) AND communicat\* AND (compan\* OR corporat\* OR organi#ation OR business OR firm OR agenc\* OR institut\* OR association\*)
* Suggested databases: Academic search (general social sciences), business source premier, Communication and mass media complete, political science complete, PsychINFO, sociological abstracts in order to cover political sciences, communication studies, business studies, sociology, psychology, social sciences more broadly
* After initial searches and check with librarian: academic search is too broad and overlaps with others
* Initial search string was refined based on the thesaurus (most sophisticated of all databases available in the social sciences – with the mapping of search terms function) of PsychINFO – this of course led to a bias toward psychological (and interpersonal) constructs such as customer relationships – we tried to level this out with detailed search strings and adjustments for the databases
* Librarian also suggested to search in the subject headings of the databases
* Search string development went over 4 rounds with librarian, where we discussed and checked the results of all databases of initial searches and refined; for instance, we added the terms dialogue,” “discourse,” and “organizational communication in the “communicative relationship with organizations” part along the way
* At the end of this process, we decided to have 3 concepts covered with the search string: relationship/relation within communicative relationships of organizations; digital; measurement
* For the database PychINFO, putting the concept “measurement” resulted not feasible, because it didn’t further limit the results after initial trial searches; we also did not add the measurement part to CMMC, because it added an unnecessary bias to the results; however, the measurement part was added to the other three databases, because the different databases’ main focus in terms of subject area and your having screened the sets of hits resulting from the narrower (i.e. measurement part) lay-out suggested a limiter here

**Search & extraction of articles**

* Search date: 12. July 2017
* Expected results initial search: round about 2,500
* Initial steps: search, extraction of results to refworks, removal of duplicates, export to Excel, screening
* Direct export from PsychINFO to refworks did not work, so we had to transfer it via a RIS file – extracted hits are extended citations (incl. references)
* We will use software package Rayyan to screen the articles
* De-duplication in refworks: Folder Relationships contains the hits without duplicates; folder Relationships\_original sample contains all articles
* Entire sample: 2799
* After removal of duplicates in refworks: 2499 --- 10,72% duplicates removed
* Another removal round in Rayyan: 22 duplicates deleted: all in all: 322 duplicates removed = 11,5%; automatic removal by Rayyan: 48 (exact duplicates): all in all 370 duplicates = 14,81 %
* Data screening started 13.07.2017
* Data screening ends on 28.07.2017
* Full-text articles consulted: 147

**Eligibility and coding:**

* Maybe for coding: take single studies as units of analysis if one article reports multiple studies that measure relationships differently? (Brubaker et al.)
* Maybe for data analysis think about network analysis of concepts and references to show that all refer more or less to the same sources
* Implemented codebook into survey software Qualtrics
* N/A – value 99
* Yes = 1; No = 0
* Same order and question numbering applied than in codebook coding order
* Eligibility phase: only include articles that explicitly measure relationships; thus, if the article only measures dialogic functions and principles (such as Kim et al. 2014; Naude et al. 2004), but does not explicitly state that it measures relationships in terms of these principles, then exclude it. This is also true for studies that claim they research something “in the context of customer-brand relationships” (Ashley and Leonard 2009, Baker et al. 2006; Bartl et al. 2013), but that do not explicitly measure the relationship, but related concepts only. Further excluded at second glance: Chang and Jang, 2009 (but very interesting!); Cho et al. 2014; Ingenhoff and Kölling, McAllister 2012; Rybalko and Seltzer; Waters et al. 2014; Cho and Hu 2010 – measures only the employment of relationship management features, but there is no recipient’s side to it 🡪 we exclude all those studies that do not consider both sides: sender and recipient. Studies that only measure if principles are employed thus do not count in.
* N = 74 left
* 3 articles not available anywhere
* Consensus session 22th August
* If an article measures two or more concepts of relationships, we have to code it twice or more, because these are then two relationship measures (e.g., Yoon et al., 2008)
* At the end of coding, do an intra-coder reliability assessment with 10% of the sample
* In case of papers that present a tested model and alternative outcome models, we code the input model
* Included another variable: umbrella concept/term – also included in codebook
* Relationship cultivation strategy = relationship maintenance strategy
* Consensus coding session on 1st september; consensus was reached on four anchor variables: concept of relationship, underlying measurement concept, DVs, and IVs
* Most definitions were the same; for some, I merged the definitions by Martine and me (especially if they included the underlying concepts)
* Definitions: marked in purple = no proper relationship definition found
* Sample: unit of analysis – concept: 95
* Sample – unit of analysis article: 74
* Excel file: those articles that have multiple relationship concepts are coded with “2” in the first column