



Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

Public Relations Review



Reluctant to talk, reluctant to listen: Public relations professionals and their involvement in CSR programmes in Spain

Isabel Ruiz-Mora^a, Jairo Lugo-Ocando^{b,*}, Antonio Castillo-Esparcia^c

^a Sheffield Hallam University, UK

^b University of Leeds, UK

^c Universidad de Málaga, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Available online xxx

Keywords:

Corporate social responsibility
Public relations
Professionalism
Spain
Dialogue
Communication

ABSTRACT

This article examines the type of contributions that public relations professionals make towards Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programmes, while discussing the issues and obstacles they face to enter into that professional area. To do so, the authors have looked at the top publicly owned companies in Spain, which are part of the so-called IBEX35®. The research included semi-structured interviews and interpretative analysis of official documents and reports. Our findings suggest that despite normative claims from CSR departments that downplay the importance of public relations in the design and implementation of CSR programmes, the empirical evidence suggests otherwise. In this context, our findings show important operational deficiencies and accountability deficits precisely because of the lack of public relations input in the design and implementation of these programmes.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier Inc.

1. Introduction

There has been some debate in relation as to who should manage and implement Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programmes (L'Etang, Lugo-Ocando, Ahmed, 2011, p. 170). In some cases these debates have centred in the incorporation and use of public relations professionals within the remit of CSR activities (Bartlett, Tywoniak, Hatcher, 2007, p. 281). This because communication is a key component of these programmes both in terms of using them to strengthen the reputation of the companies (Bebbington, Larrinaga, & Moneva, 2008, p. 337) as well as the need to engage stakeholders and the general public in order to achieve its wider objectives. However, one of the most common experiences – at least in Spain – is that these same organisations have been reluctant to incorporate public relations professionals in the core design and implementation of their CSR programmes and only use tangentially their own public relations departments in order to disseminate final outcomes and achievements of their CSR-related programmes.

This last happens despite the fact that an important body of research indicates that the origins, theories, processes, and primary responsibilities between public relations and CSR are similar (Clark, 2000; L'Etang et al., 2011; Sriramesh, Ng, Ting, & Wanyin, 2007). These scholarly comparisons have also highlighted a key difference whereby effective communication methods and professional communication approaches are largely absent from the social responsibility practice and liter-

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: i.ruiz-mora@shu.ac.uk (I. Ruiz-Mora), j.lugo-ocando@leeds.ac.uk (J. Lugo-Ocando), acastilloe@uma.es (A. Castillo-Esparcia).

ature. These same scholars have indicated the need to include such techniques in order to enhance the development and overall impact of managing corporate-stakeholder relationships (Clark, 2000, p. 363). This clearly suggests that a more active involvement of public relations in the realm of CSR could greatly benefit both areas not only by making more dynamic the overall public engagement of CSR with its audiences, stakeholders and general public, but also by allowing public relations to link more actively with one of the key areas of the modern organisation.

This article examines the type of contributions that public relations professionals make towards CSR programmes, while discussing the issues and obstacles they face to enter into that professional area. To do so, the authors have looked at the top 35 publically owned companies in Spain, which are part of the so-called IBEX35[®] quoted in the Madrid stock market (known as BME). The research included 28 semi-structured interviews with managers responsible of CSR in these organisations and interpretative analysis of 33 official documents and reports.

The overall research indicates that despite normative claims from CSR departments that downplay public relations' relative importance and potential contributions, there are nevertheless important gaps in terms of objectives, achievements and performance precisely because of the lack of engagement with public relations. To be sure, the empirical evidence shows important operational deficiencies and accountability deficits due to the absence of professional communication know-how input in the design and implementation of CSR programmes.

Overall, we argue that social responsibility in business should be a real means for reaching the coveted and desired dialogue with the public. In so doing, we suggest that public relations can make an important contribution with regards to this aim by promoting dialogue and understanding with stakeholders; involving them in the design, formulation and implementation of CSR policy. The research was possible thanks to a grant from the Junta de Andalucía awarded through their Department of Science, Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Spain.

2. Literature review

Research regarding public relations practitioners' contribution to CSR has identified broadly five roles for public relations: management, philanthropic, value-driven, communication, and no role at all. In these same studies, public relations professionals have expressed important limitations to their ability to contribute to CSR programs (Kim & Reber, 2008, p. 337), while highlighting the absence of public relations and communication in general from CSR policies and programmes (Clark, 2000, p. 364).

Overall, managing relations with the public is postulated as the quintessential role of public relations (Grunig & Hunt, 2003; Harlow, 1976; Seitel, 2002) and therefore, a necessary element for the proper development of CSR. Hence, one can expect public relations to be part of the design criteria of CSR policy (Oliveira & Nader, 2006, p. 104) as the relationship management with stakeholders is at the heart of CSR as functions of public relations (Wang & Chaudhri, 2009, p. 247).

In this context, the relationship between corporate social responsibility and public relations has been defined by the work of authors such as L'Etang (2006, 2009), González (2006), Capriotti & Moreno (2007), Signitzer & Prexl (2008), Kim and Reber (2008), Castillo-Esparcia (2009), Míguez (2011), Raupp (2011) and Ruiz-Mora (2012), among others. Other authors who have explored the importance of public relations in relation to CSR include Black (2011), Cutlip, Center and Broom (2001) and Seitel (2002) who have highlighted the importance of public relations for CSR. There is a broad consensus among these authors that there is an important link between CSR and public relations and that within this link there is the need for public relations to inform part of the work of CSR as its outcomes concern both the general public and stakeholders.

In fact, most definitions of CSR refer to the relationship with the public. These definitions understand it as 'the voluntary integration by companies of social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders' (European Commission, 2001, p. 7). As Grunig and Hunt (2003, p. 106) pointed out, accountability to the public is a capital premise of public relations, while others such as Daugherty (2011, pp. 390–92) have underlined that public relations is the practice of social responsibility.

CSR theories tend to focus their attention on the stakeholders while alluding to the need to manage public relations within organisations. To be sure, as Capriotti and Moreno (2007, p. 85) have highlighted, 'the communication function is at the heart of CSR and corporate citizenship'. Theories of CSR generally require the integration of the management of relationships with stakeholders; these theories include the Theory of Stakeholders (Freeman, 1984), the Theory of the Pyramid of CSR (Carroll, 1991), the Theory of Legitimization (Lindblom, 1994) and the ethical approach and its relation to CSR (Cortina, 1994). These theories point out at a Weberian type that ideally should define the incorporation of public relations in the remit of CSR design, formulation, implementation and evaluation.

There is, nevertheless, an important gap between what these ideal types should be and the reality on the ground. Recent studies in Spain, for example, highlight that public relations practitioners are largely excluded from the CSR management areas. This research indicates that only 11% of the professionals working in CSR in that country have a 'communications' background (Argandoña, Fontrodona, Ramón, & García, 2008, p. 3). Other research in the field have shown that the great majority of those in charge of CSR in Spanish companies have degrees in business, followed by those who studied environmental science or related fields (DIRSE, 2014, p.13), while people with degrees in communication are all but invisible in this area. In light of this, the aim of the authors of this article is to explain the absence of public relations in CSR programmes, while examining the implications of this situation in the boarder context of professional practice of public relations within the modern organisation.

3. Approaches and methods

Our work included research strategies such as questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The interviews were anonymised in order to protect the identity of the subjects and allowed them a greater degree of freedom to respond. These results were triangulated with data drawn from the interpretative analysis of CSR reports from the companies studied here. The research focused on Spanish companies listed in the Spanish stock market index IBEX 35[®] in 2012, this because these are the largest companies in that country, presumably with the biggest allocation of resources to CSR. The questionnaires were distributed among the professionals responsible for defining and implementing the CSR programmes of the companies in our study. The survey was grouped into three sections; general data, team and CSR department.

Interpretative analysis was applied to social responsibility reports of the companies listed on the IBEX35[®]. We analysed the 2010 CSR reports, which were the ones available at the time of our research. To carry out this analysis, we designed a data collection tool ad hoc that facilitated the collection of data, its systematisation and subsequent comparative analysis. We designed an instrument that allowed us to perform an interpretative and contextualise analysis of each CSR annual report. The categorisation of the data analysis was as follows: General information (basic information, CSR, important issues); Stakeholders (dialogue, categorization, CSR policies); Social Responsibility (corporate governance and other information about CSR); Transparency; Regulatory support (CSR); and, Public Relations (PR issues identified).

4. Results and findings

100% of the people in charge of CSR in these companies had a university degree, 38% of which had a Masters and 6% had achieved or were undertaking a PhD. Most of their backgrounds were in economics and finance, environmental science and management. One of the key findings of our fieldwork is the fact that while an important part of the activities of CSR managers is closely related to public relations, they largely lack professional training in any area related to professional communications. From 28 companies, only one department had a person with a communications background in charge of CSR. But even in this case, the background was not in public relations but rather in journalism.

Despite the fact that the link between CSR departments and communications departments is strategic in terms of the relations with stakeholders and the public (Clark, 2000), most of the interviewees considered public relations 'irrelevant' to CSR programmes, although they did acknowledge the use of the communication departments when they had to disseminate aspects of the CSR programme among the media outlets and the public in general. In fact, 64% of the people in charge of CSR programmes do not consider necessary the incorporation of public relations professionals.

The broad consensus among CSR departments is that the participation of public relations professionals in their own area is not only redundant, as these companies already have communication departments, but also is not pertinent as CSR require specialised technical knowledge that goes above and beyond, as one of the interviewed said, 'what public relations professionals can offer'. Other of the interviewees went to say that he 'would hire any professional except a public relations professional'. Only 36% of those surveyed think that public relations practitioners should be included in particular programmes but, nevertheless, circumscribed to specific tasks related to communications and dissemination of information among stakeholders.

This general perception among CSR managers regarding the 'uselessness' of public relations in their own camp, contrasts abysmally with our findings which suggest that CSR departments do perform a great deal of activities and tasks often associated with public relations. For example, 21% of those in charge of CSR programmes have as their main responsibility the communication with stakeholders, followed by 18% whose main task is to deal with the company's reputation; both of them activities closely related to public relations (Hutton, Goodman, Alexander, & Genest, 2001; L'Etang, 2008). More striking, perhaps, is the fact that 64% of those surveyed consider that communication is a crucial part of CSR, while 46% of them see their relation with communication departments as 'strategic'.

However, most of the CSR managers insist that these tasks do not require professional communication and see themselves as capable of carrying them out despite lacking specialisation in this area. In other words, CSR departments do recognise the need of professional communication but not as an intrinsic part of their own departments or do they recognise the need for trained personnel to manage this area. Moreover, the fact that these managers think that they can carry out themselves these tasks, indicates that they do not seem to appreciate the degree of complexity that professional communications practices entitles.

The overall study also revealed what skills are mostly valued for those aspiring to become a CSR manager. While a public relations profile is not the most desirable, neither can we say that there is one specific profile per se. The consensus among CSR departments is that its managers must have a comprehensive profile that includes a 'humanist vision' of the organisation. The manager 'must be already in a senior management position' and 'be able to understand the company and its strategy'.

4.1. What the reports say

Analysing CSR reports from the companies studied here, we can argue that they reflect the importance of communication, while stressing the different strategies that are undertaken by the company to both disseminate what is happening in relation to CSR and strengthen the reputation of the company. This, nevertheless, contrasts with what in fact happens in practice in terms of the incorporation of professional communication in those CSR departments. Indeed, most CSR reports are directed

primarily to specific internal stakeholders and shareholders as their main audiences. In this context, most of the documents analysed in this study tend to identify their employees and everything that has to do with them as a primary target of their actions, while environment, education and training are the second areas of focus.

It is also important to draw attention to which areas are identified in these reports as priority subjects. For example, 91% of the reports refer to health and safety, 88% to research and development, 88% to political equality, 88% to work-family balance and 82% to integration and diversity. It is also worth highlighting that most of these areas greatly depend upon professional communication intervention.

In relation to external publics, 76% of the reports highlight solidarity and cooperation with NGOs projects with other countries, 67% underlined actions related to poverty and social exclusion, 61% referred to corporate volunteering, 58% underlined culture, arts and sports and 38% included references to actions towards disaster relief. Again, the reports bring priority areas and actions that heavily require professional communication intervention.

These same reports made direct reference to specific activities associated with public relations; 85% of them provided information about the tools of dialogue and participation used in these organisations. Moreover, 85% of these reports refer to risk management as one of their areas of competence, 76% refer to relationships with stakeholders, 61% to corporate image and reputation, 61% to internal communication management, 61% to communication channels and 52% to external communication management. CSR reports also claim as areas of competence 'responsible' marketing and advertising (33%).

From this data it is clear that there is an important gap between what the CSR reports say about the realm of competences of professional communication and what actually these departments incorporate as part of their organisational structures in terms of human resources and activities. While these departments normatively claim and recognise the importance of professional communication, this seems not to resonate in their daily practices.

As corollary to this paradox between what is said and what is actually done is worth mentioning that 82% of companies submit their CSR reports outside the organisation, making it in fact an external communication practice. Despite this and the fact that the reports are such an important communication tool, the majority of them are elaborated by the CSR departments with little or no input from professional communication experts.

5. What is lost?

The next question to ask is to what degree does this paradox matter in terms of delivering the desired outcomes and achieving the organisation's goals. In other words, to what extent does the lack of professional communication affects the performance of CSR departments. Certainly, one of the greatest deficiencies that our studies shows among CSR departments in Spain is the fact that despite strategic considerations regarding the importance of opening dialogic spaces with their stakeholders (Burchell & Cook 2006; O'Riordan, & Fairbrass, 2008), these dialogues merely exists in practice in the cases studied here. In fact, only one of the individuals surveyed said that they had effectively consulted their internal publics when designing their CSR programmes, while none of the 28 interviewees did so with the external ones. This says a great deal about how unidirectional CSR programmes are and how little involvement there is from the stakeholders.

Indeed, when we talk about public relations it is important to understand that we are referring to dialogue and dialogic communication that builds relationships that serve both organisational and public interests (Kent & Taylor, 2002, p. 21). This implies that publics cannot be considered a subsidiary element of the relationship. Instead, they need to be acknowledged as a core element in achieving a real communication between the organisation and its publics, where both parts have the same status.

In this sense, Kent & Taylor (2002, pp. 25–29) listed the principles of dialogue in public relations as mutuality, propinquity, empathy, risk and commitment. These are principles of any relationship between human beings and therefore should be core to any attempt to establish a relationship with stakeholders. This in spite of the fact that the concept of dialogue can be controversial and sometimes unclear (Theunissen & Wan Noordien, 2012, p. 5) as not always organisations and publics are in the same level in the public field (Piecicka, 2011, p. 117).

6. Conclusions

The overall findings suggest that public relations professionals are not considered to be 'fit for purpose' by those managing CSR programmes in the biggest companies in Spain. Neither do these managers see public relations as an essential part of their own activities, despite overwhelming evidence and numerous theoretical approaches that indicate the contrary. We believe that these views are in part the result of a complex set of circumstances which require further research such as the historical development and cultural contexts of public relations in Spain.

To start with, and based in some of the subsequent conversations with CSR managers, there seems to be both a widespread unawareness regarding the professional status of modern public relations practice as well as a generalised perception of it as a 'mischievous' area that has a problematic reputation even within the organisation. In follow-up conversations with CSR managers, the consensus was that public relations practitioners had a very limited scope of competence and could deliver very little towards achieving CSR general goals.

Studies in other parts of the world seem to reinforce our conclusions as they also indicate that the image of public relations professionals is under continual questioning and that it is still seen as a profession that is not taken 'too seriously' within the organisation (Islas, 2005, p. 42). In response to this, Piecicka (2011, p.120) states that 'the constitution of public relations

professional jurisdiction needs to be broad and extensive in terms of communication theories, applications, and practices in order to sustain the profession in times of change'.

The other cause for the dismissal of public relations among CSR managers is far more structural and is related to how CSR is conceptualised and viewed by those managing these programmes. This can be subdivided in two specific arguments, although closely intertwined. One that sees CSR as a social extension of the organisations' commitment towards the wider society and the other that conceives CSR as a highly technically and specialised sets of tasks, despite the recognition of the need for a 'humanistic' worldview from those managing these programmes.

Consequently, because CSR is seen by many of these managers as a 'social extension' of the companies' activities rather than embraced as a process of internal and external accountability towards its stakeholders and the public, the overall understanding is that is an activity in which communication is secondary to the core of the tasks, despite normative claims of the contrary. In this particular aspect, CSR can learn a great deal from other areas of professional communication such as science communication which after many years of struggle has finally managed to convince a great part of the scientific community to engage communication as a core element of research and innovation.

Just as it happened with science communication in its time (Bauer & Bucchi, 2007; Dean, 2009; Nisbet & Scheufele, 2009), CSR is still seen by many inside the organisations studied here as an activity that delivers 'technical' goods and which therefore needs to be designed by 'specialised professionals' who have 'technical' skills and abilities but in which public relations practitioners have no role to play. For them, communication is not a technical area that requires specialised know-how to manage it.

Contrary to this general negative perception, we argue that professional communication has an important function within CSR. To be sure, the most problematic aspect of our findings was the absence of consultation with the public and the stakeholders. It is in relation to this pivotal gap in which professional communication in general and public relations in particular can make the most important contribution of all. That is to open spaces of true dialogue that can inform the organisation's management in the process of formulation, design, implementation and evaluation of CSR programmes. This, we believe, can help CSR programmes to become an instrument that enhances the organisations' transparency towards the world outside and makes them fit to face the old and new ethical challenges posed to them by a changing society.

We do recognise, however, that public relations practice and the management of CSR programmes in Spain present particular specificities (Arceo, 2004; Murillo & Lozana, 2006; Tilson & Pérez, 2003) that perhaps are not that present in other contexts. We know, for example, that professional communication plays a more central role in CSR programmes in other countries (Kim & Reber, 2008; Middlemiss, 2003). Therefore, we should be careful when drawing conclusions from these findings as they are not necessarily applicable to all cases.

Nevertheless, some wider lessons can be learnt as the experiences of Spanish practitioners are becoming increasingly relevant to all. Particularly in light of new European Union legislation that now require companies employing over 500 people to 'communicate' what they do socially and environmentally in terms of CSR (EU, 2014). This new directive makes it mandatory not only to be accountable of what these companies do beyond their financial activities, but also to explain to the public and its own stakeholders why they failed to achieve specific CSR goals.

In this new scenario, it is no longer sufficient to show the 'good deeds' that an organisation does, but it is also necessary to keep informed and engage the public with CSR programmes from the start. This was certainly the lesson learnt by Nestlé in its dealings with *Greenpeace* over claims made in social media that the food conglomerate kept sourcing palm oil from Sinar Mas, the Indonesian company accused of illegal deforestation (Khor, 2011; Pye, 2009). This is an emblematic case that shows what happens when professional communication is absent from the CSR programmes.

To avoid such experiences, CSR managers, despite all their reservations, will need to learn to listen and consult public relations practitioners. More important, CSR managers will need to put their ear on the ground in a more humble manner and treat the general public and their own stakeholders as 'equals' in the articulation, design, implementation and evaluation of their own policies and programmes. Otherwise, CSR will be in danger of becoming another cosmetic palliative that will fade away as many other managerial fashions have done in the past.

References

- Arceo, A. (2004). *Public relations in Spain: an introduction*. *Public Relations Review*, 30(3), 293–302.
- Argandoña, A., Fontrodona, J., Ramón, J. & García, P., 2008. El perfil emergente del directivo de RSC. Barcelona Documento de Investigación DI-756 Universidad de Navarra.
- Bartlett, J., Tywoniak, S., & Hatcher, C. (2007). *Public relations professional practice and the institutionalisation of CSR*. *Journal of Communication Management*, 11(4), 281–299.
- Bauer, M. W., & Bucchi, M. (2007). *Journalism, science and society: science communication between news and public relations*. London: Routledge.
- Bebbington, J., Larrinaga, C., & Moneva, J. M. (2008). *Corporate social reporting and reputation risk management*. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 21(3), 337–361.
- Black, S. (2011). *ABC de las relaciones públicas*. pp. 2000. Barcelona: Gestion.
- Burchell, J., & Cook, J. (2006). *It's good to talk? Examining attitudes towards corporate social responsibility dialogue and engagement processes*. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 15(2), 154–170.
- Capriotti, P., & Moreno, A. (2007). *Corporate citizenship and public relations: the importance and interactivity of social responsibility issues on corporate websites*. *Public Relations Review*, 33(1), 84–91.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). *The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders*. *Business Horizons*, 34, 39–48.
- Castillo-Esparcia, A. (2009). *Relaciones públicas. teoría e historia*. Barcelona: UOC.
- Clark, C. E. (2000). *Differences between public relations and corporate social responsibility: an analysis*. *Public Relations Review*, 26(3), 363–380.

- Cortina, A. (1994). *Ética de la empresa*. Madrid: Trotta.
- Cutlip, S. M., Center, A. H., & Broom, G. M. (2001). *Relaciones públicas eficaces*. pp. 2000. Barcelona: Gestión.
- Daugherty, E. L. (2011). Public relations and social responsibility. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 389–401). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dean, C. (2009). *Am i making myself clear? A scientist's guide to talking to the public*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- DIRSE. 2014. Estudio de la función de responsabilidad social en la empresa española. Fielded work on professional profile of CSR practitioners. Madrid: asociación española de directivos de responsabilidad social, DIRSE.
- EU, 2014. Directivas 78/660/CEE y 83/349/CEE. [Online] Available at: http://observatoriorsc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Propuesta_EU_reporte_no_financiero_abril_2013.pdf [accessed 20.12.14.].
- European Commission. (2001). *Green paper: promoting a european framework for corporate social responsibility*. Brussels: European Commission European Commission.
- http://www.csr-in-commerce.eu/document_library.php/en/717/green-paper-quotpromoting-a-european-framework-for-corporate-social-responsibilityquot-
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: a stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman Publishing.
- González, A. (2006). Comunicación de crisis y responsabilidad social corporativa. In P. Capriotti, & F. J. Garrido (Eds.), *Guía de la responsabilidad social empresarial (RSE)* (pp. 8–11). Fascículo 4. Santiago (Chile): Universidad del Desarrollo/Diario Financiero.
- Grunig, J., & Hunt, T. y. (2003). *Dirección de Relaciones Públicas*. pp. 2000. Barcelona: Gestión.
- Harlow, R. F. (1976). Building a public relations definition. *Public Relations Review*, 2(4), 34–42.
- Hutton, J. G., Goodman, M. B., Alexander, J. B., & Genest, C. M. (2001). Reputation management: the new face of corporate public relations? *Public Relations Review*, 27(3), 247–261.
- Islas, O. (2005). De las Relaciones Públicas a la Comunicación Estratégica. *Revista latinoamericana de Comunicación Chasqui*, 89, 40–47.
- <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/160/16008911.pdf>
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 28(1), 21–37.
- Khor, Y. L. (2011). The oil palm industry bows to NGO campaigns. *Lipid Technology*, 23(5), 102–104.
- Kim, S. Y., & Reber, B. H. (2008). Public relations' place in corporate social responsibility: practitioners define their role. *Public Relations Review*, 34(4), 337–342.
- L'Etang, J., Lugo-Ocando, J., & Ahmed, Z. (2011). Ethics, CSR, power and strategic communication. In Ø. Ihlen, J. Bartlett, & S. May (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and corporate social responsibility* (pp. 170–187). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- L'Etang, J. (2006). Corporate responsibility and public relations ethics. In J. L'Etang, & M. Pieczka (Eds.), *Public relations. critical debates and contemporary practice* (pp. 405–422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- L'Etang, J. (2009). *Relaciones públicas. conceptos, práctica y crítica*. Barcelona: UOC.
- L'Etang, J. (2008). *Public relations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lindblom, C. K. (1994). The implications of organizational legitimacy for corporate social performance and disclosure. In *Critical Perspectives on Accounting Conference* (p. 1994).
- Middlemiss, N. (2003). Authentic not cosmetic: CSR as brand enhancement. *The Journal of Brand Management*, 10(4), 353–361.
- Míguez, M. I. (2011). La investigación sobre relaciones públicas en las revistas españolas de comunicación (2008–2010). *Icono14*, A6, 124–138.
- Murillo, D., & Lozana, J. M. (2006). SMEs and CSR: an approach to CSR in their own words. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(3), 227–240.
- Nisbet, M. C., & Scheufele, D. A. (2009). What's next for science communication? Promising directions and lingering distractions. *American Journal of Botany*, 96(10), 1767–1778.
- O'Riordan, L., & Fairbrass, J. (2008). Corporate social responsibility (CSR): models and theories in stakeholder dialogue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(4), 745–758.
- Oliveira, M. J. D. C., & Nader, S. (2006). Relações públicas na gestão da responsabilidade social: desafio e oportunidade. *Organicom*, 5, 97–107.
- Pieczka, M. (2011). Public relations as dialogic expertise? *Journal of Communication Management*, 15(2), 108–124.
- Pye, O. (2009). Palm oil as a transnational crisis in South-East Asia. *Austrian Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 2(2), 81–101.
- Raupp, J. (2011). The concept of stakeholders and its relevance for Corporate Social responsibility Communication. In O. Ihlen, J. L. Bartlett, & S. May (Eds.), *The handbook of communication and corporate social responsibility* (pp. 476–494). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ruiz-Mora, I. (2012). Las relaciones con los públicos y su reflejo en las memorias de Responsabilidad Social. *Revista Internacional de Relaciones Públicas*, 11(4), 173–200.
- Seitel, F. (2002). *Teoría y práctica de las Relaciones Públicas*. Madrid: Pretencie Hal.
- Signitzer, B., & Prexl, A. (2008). Corporate sustainability communications: aspects of theory and professionalization. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 20, 1–19.
- Sriramesh, K., Ng, C. W., Ting, S. T., & Wanyin, L. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and public relations. In G. Cheney, J. Roper, & S. May (Eds.), *The debate over corporate social responsibility* (pp. 119–134). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Theunissen, P., & Wan Noordin, W. N. (2012). Revisiting the concept dialogue in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 38(1), 5–13.
- Tilson, D. J., & Pérez, P. S. (2003). Public relations and the new golden age of Spain: a confluence of democracy, economic development and the media. *Public Relations Review*, 29(2), 125–143.
- Wang, J., & Chaudhri, V. (2009). Corporate social responsibility engagement and communication by Chinese companies. *Public Relations Review*, 35.