ELSEVIER

# Global public relations and communication management: A European perspective

Dejan Verčič [a,*], Ansgar Zerfass [b], Markus Wiesenberg [c]

[a] *University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, Kardeljevapl. 5, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*
[b] *University of Leipzig, Germany and BI Norwegian Business School, Oslo, Norway*
[c] *University of Leipzig, Germany*

A R T I C L E  I N F O

A B S T R A C T

The article reviews the status of international public relations research and reports on a pan-European study into international communication practices in the corporate sector. It is based on a quantitative survey of 579 heads of corporate communication from 21 European countries and a semi-structured qualitative survey of 42 chief communication officers (CCOs) in large multinationals from 12 European countries. Results reveal that international public relations are a part of daily business for more than 90 percent of CCOs in Europe, with nearly a quarter of them dealing with 20 countries or more. Sensitivity to multiple cultures while preserving core identity and the ability to change is the main challenges, along with the language(s) problem where introduction of English as the business lingua franca is only a partial solution. Only about a half of CCOs reported solid structures for international public relations operations.

## 1. Global public relations and communication management: a European perspective

Globalization is increasing economic, social, and political interdependencies around the world. Consequently, public relations as a discipline are more often charged with managing communication and relationships between organizations and their stakeholders on an international level (Verčič, 2013b). As more actors consciously use public relations globally, its description and explanation gain on the global level in importance. Yet "in a global context, systematic empirical research in public relations is rare" (Verčič, 2013a; p. 17).

Although there is a noticeable rise in publications on international and global public relations, Wakefield (2011) noted "the scarcity of theory specific to public relations in global organizations." Ni (2013) proposed two major perspectives for the examination of public relations in the global(ization) context: cross-cultural comparison (comparing practices in different countries) and intercultural interaction (communication in intercultural settings). Curtin and Gaither (2007) identified four clusters of studies in international public relations: (1) analyses of how national cultures influence public relations practice, (2) analyses of the relevance of US-centric public relations models in other countries, (3) comparisons of public relations practices across regions or countries through case studies, and (4) studies of international public relations practiced by governments. One can note that many authors from the United States classify studies done in other countries as international public relations. Jain, De Moya, & Molleda, 2014 reviewed articles on international public relations published from 2006 to

---

* Corresponding author.
*E-mail address:* dejan.vercic@fdv.uni-lj.si (D. Verčič).

2011 in 12 peer reviewed journals. They found that 77% of 200 journal articles identified were concerned with domestic public relations practice in a region/nation other than the US, only 18% with cross-country analyses and 5% with global issues or organizations. International public relations in academic journals predominantly means public relations practiced in a country other than the home country of the publication (and is often written by domestic researchers from within those countries and cultures). There is an obvious scarcity of empirical research on international and global public relations.

This article tries to close the research gap by reviewing the status of international public relations theorizing and research and reporting on a pan-European study into international public relations practices in the corporate sector. Multinational enterprises are at the very center of economic globalization (Kleinert, 2001). How do they and how should they practice international public relations?

## 2. Literature review

Sharpe and Pritchard (2004) noted that "the development of public relations as a profession globally correlates with historical developments in three areas: communication, democracy, and global social interdependence" (p. 35). Indeed, as Sriramesh (2008) summarized: "Globalization seems to be the hallmark of the 21st century just as democratization was the legacy of the 20th century" (p. 409).

Verčič et al., 1996Verčič, Grunig, & Grunig, 1996 proposed a framework of *generic principles and specific applications* for international public relations. Organizations should have core competencies and policies that are valid worldwide, while at the same time their implementation in different parts of the world should appreciate local specialties. These they organized into five environmental variables: political ideology, economic system, degree of activism, culture, and media system. The theory of generic principles and specific applications resonates with the *Stockholm Accords* and the *Melbourne Mandate* (The Global Alliance for Public Relations and Communication Management, 2010, 2012) in emphasizing the importance of public relations for the core character and values of an organization with respectful and responsible relations with various social environments.

The notion of generic principles and specific applications resembles the broader concept of *glocalization*. Wakefield (2007) found this too rigid for a full appreciation of local stakeholders and for relationship management. He proposed an extension of the generic principles and specific application framework and termed it "world-class public relations" (Wakefield, 2011). In the *world-class public relations model*, organizations should perpetually and simultaneously think global and local and act global and local. The model proposed six factors which are important for its effectiveness: purpose, executive support, staffing and teamwork, training, communication style, and response preparedness.

Building on the notion of generic principles and specific applications, Sriramesh and Verčič (2001, 2009) proposed a *theoretical framework for global public relations* in which they comprised the original five environmental variables into three factors: a country's infrastructure (composed of the political system, legal system, level of economic development, and the level of social activism), media environment (media control, outreach, and access), and societal culture.

A special challenge for international public relations practice is "cross-national conflict shifting" which describes the situation when actions in one country also have consequences in another country (Molleda & Quinn, 2004). With the advent of the Internet and the growing ubiquity of social media, some even argue that all public relations are becoming global and that domestic public relations no longer exists (Falconi, 2010). News of the death of domestic public relations may be exaggerated but globalization is permeating ever greater areas of communication work, and in many ways international public relations represents the most challenging part of the profession: "It demands more work in a more complex environment" (Verčič 2009; p. 804). Not only practice, research into international and global public relations is also challenging. Gregory and Halff (2013) reviewed the challenges stemming from global complexity and claimed that they "do not propose to give up empirical research [in international and global public relations] altogether" (p. 424). Taylor (2001) urged for examination of presuppositions underlying public relations theory and research into the context of international public relations. Wakefield (2001) declared that what "public relations needs are 'paradigm shift' to reflect its emerging globalization" (p. 641), which is: "The global should become the strategic umbrella by which all domestic programs are carried out" (p. 643).

Cornelissen et al., 2006 Cornelissen, Bekkum, & van Ruler (2006) argued toward a practice-based theoretical conceptualization of corporate communication to supplement the theoretical notion of transformation of communication from a "functionary" activity into a strategic management function (Grunig, 2006; Verčič & Grunig, 2000). Their empirical investigation covered a set of case studies in European multinational firms (Nokia, Shell, Siemens, and Philips). They found strategic positioning and cultural accommodation of the communication function as the major challenges needing further study in practice, and they highlighted the importance of organizing the communication function for organizations: "In other words, the way in which communications is organized carries important strategic and political dimensions and is also crucial for the effective support and integration of communication activities" (Cornelissen et al., 2006; p. 120). Coordination and control, centralization and decentralization of the international public relations function are among the central topics of studies in multinational corporations and organizations (Molleda, 2009), with evidence suggesting that public relations are still predominantly "practiced in a monolithic fashion with multinational agencies replicating global strategies with only minimal, if any, variations that suit local socio-political conditions" (Sriramesh & Verčič, 2007; p. 357). Wakefield (2001) and Botan (1992), on the other hand, declared that "successful public relations in the multinational is not 'top-down'" (p. 644), but that has to be empirically investigated.

**Table 1**
Communicating internationally with different countries and markets.

| | Listed companies | | Privately-owned companies | | Overall |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | (%) | Frequency | (%) | (%) |
| Yes, regularly | 199 | 63.4 | 140 | 52.8 | 58.5 |
| Yes, sometimes | 89 | 28.3 | 96 | 36.2 | 32.0 |
| No | 26 | 8.3 | 29 | 10.9 | 9.5 |

*Notes*: $n = 579$ heads of communication (CCOs) of companies in Europe. The values show how many of the respondents approved each statement. Significant differences between listed and privately-owned companies (chi-square test, $p \leq 0.05$, Cramér's $V = 0.209$).

So, it is important to question how practitioners are prepared for work on the global scene (Freitag, 2002; Newsom, VanSlyke Turk, & Kruckeberg, 2001), including cultural "in-awareness" (Zaharna, 2001) and considerations of indigenous local cultural practices around the world (Choi & Cameron, 2009). Multinational corporations nowadays operate predominantly in English as *the joint language* with new challenges for both native and non-native language users (Vesala-Varttala & Varttala, 2010). While there are not enough studies on the dominant Western-based multinationals, there is even less research on companies globalizing from domestic emerging economies, such as the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, China, India, South Africa), which often differ from their Western competitors in that they are not private or public (listed on stock exchanges), but government (state) owned companies. We are obviously faced with growing diversity on the scene with ever more actors of different origins, values, and shapes so that: "Paying attention to the immense diversity that exists in the world is going to be critical to the success of public relations activities in the 21st century" (Sriramesh, 2008; p. 423). To paraphrase Sriramesh, if globalization is the hallmark of the 21st century, diversity is its character.

The literature review for this paper provided material from which research questions were generated. The research focusses on issues related to the practice of international public relations by practitioners in Europe and in global enterprises with headquarters in Europe. The study addresses five research questions:

RQ1: How important is international communication for European CCOs?

RQ2: What are the main challenges for international public relations practice?

RQ3: How is the international public relations function organized?

RQ4: What strategies are used to internationalize the communication function?

RQ5: What are the main challenges in international public relations for the future?

## 3. Method

The research questions were addressed with a quantitative survey and semi-structured qualitative interviews. The survey was carried out in March 2013 on a sample of 579 chief communication officers in private and listed companies from 39 European countries as part of a larger study on strategic communication based on the largest database of PR professionals on the continent. Additionally, from June to August 2013, 42 chief communication officers of global corporations (operationalized as: a company operating in at least five countries of which at least one has to be on another continent) with headquarters in Europe (with an average of 67,000 employees) were interviewed. They were located in 12 different countries. The survey was evaluated using descriptive and analytical statistics with the software SPSS. Qualitative interviews were analyzed with an inductive content analysis; statements were summarized into core issues, chosen and classified by repeated examination and comparison.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Importance of international communication for European CCOs (RQ1)

International public relations are a part of daily business for more than 90 percent of CCOs in Europe, with nearly a quarter of them dealing with 20 countries or more. Table 1 shows the distribution of responses to the question: "In your daily job, do you communicate internationally with different countries and markets?" There are statistically significant differences between private and public (listed) companies with the latter being more internationalized.

Differences between private and public companies also exist in numbers of countries: CCOs in listed companies deal with more countries than those in private companies. As public companies are often larger than private companies, it is possible that this difference is a consequence of the third variable, the size, but that was not controlled in this study. Table 2 shows results for the question: "How many countries do you deal with in your communication role?"

While operating in so many countries, it is not surprising that European CCOs strongly agree with a statement that "Communicating internationally is important for my organization" – again with CCOs from listed companies agreeing statistically significantly more strongly than their colleagues from private companies (see Table 3). However, when asked about the future ("Communicating internationally will become more important within the next three years"), heads of communica-

ARTICLE IN PRESS

4                          *D. Verčič et al. / Public Relations Review xxx (2015) xxx–xxx*

**Table 2**
Range of countries dealt with by chief communication officers.

| | Listed companies | | Privately-owned companies | | Overall |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | (%) | Frequency | (%) | (%) |
| Up to 5 countries | 106 | 36.8 | 113 | 47.9 | 41.8 |
| 6–10 countries | 59 | 20.5 | 51 | 21.6 | 21.0 |
| 11–20 countries | 47 | 16.3 | 28 | 11.9 | 14.3 |
| More than 20 countries | 76 | 26.4 | 44 | 18.6 | 22.9 |

*Notes*: $n$ = 579 heads of communication (CCOs) of companies in Europe. The values show how many of the respondents approved each statement. Significant differences between listed and privately-owned companies (chi-square test, $p \leq 0.05$, Cramér's V = 0.132).

**Table 3**
Importance of international communication for companies.

| | Listed companies | | Privately-owned companies | | Overall | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | t | df |
| Communicating internationally is important for the organization | 4.26 | 1.131 | 4.03 | 1.226 | 4.15 | 2.377[*] | 543 |
| Communicating internationally will become more important within the next three years | 4.22 | 1.083 | 4.12 | 1.118 | 4.17 | 1.042 | 554 |

*Notes*: $n$ = 579 heads of communication (CCOs) of companies in Europe. All items are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
  [*] $p \leq 0.05$.

**Table 4**
Regions targeted by international communication activities.

| | Listed companies | | Privately-owned companies | | Overall |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | (%) | Frequency | (%) | (%) |
| Europe | 286 | 99.3 | 234 | 99.2 | 99.2 |
| North America | 124 | 43.1 | 97 | 41.1 | 42.2 |
| East Asia | 92 | 31.9 | 67 | 28.4 | 30.3 |
| Middle East | 84 | 29.2 | 64 | 27.1 | 28.2 |
| Latin America | 90 | 31.3 | 62 | 26.3 | 29.0 |
| South and Southeast Asia | 78 | 27.1 | 62 | 26.3 | 26.7 |
| Africa | 64 | 22.2 | 45 | 19.1 | 20.8 |
| Pacific | 51 | 17.7 | 47 | 19.9 | 18.7 |

*Notes*: $n$ = 579 heads of communication (CCOs) of companies in Europe. The values show how many of the respondents approved each statement.

tion from both private and public companies agree on the growing importance of international communication for their work.

Table 4 shows which regions are targeted by the communication activities of European CCOs (with multiple answers possible to this question). Europe tops the list, but nearly half of the respondents communicate in North America and around a third in East Asia, Middle East, Latin America, and South and Southeast Asia (in descending order).

It is clear that international public relations is very important for European CCOs as it is taking up a large part of their work; and they believe that it will become even more important.

### 4.2. Main challenges for international public relations practice (RQ2)

When asked to estimate how challenging different aspects of their work are when communicating internationally, especially in non-European countries, European CCOs see various problems to deal with (see Table 5).

Considering how many countries they operate in (nearly a quarter of them in 20 or more countries), it is easy to appreciate how hard it is to understand media systems and public spheres, monitor public opinion and understand stakeholders, and on that basis develop communication strategies with social, cultural, and political sensitivity. Also finding local communicators in all these countries and leading them is a challenge.

In the qualitative interviews, European CCOs presented themselves as self-reflecting and aware of complex cultural challenges. Sensitivity to cultural identities is growing in importance. Global heads of corporate communications underline individual and organizational change as being part of companies going international and getting in touch with other cultures not only geographically but also ethically and socially. The introduction of (often quite bad) English as the business *lingua*

**Table 5**
Major challenges of international public relations practice in non-European countries.

| | Listed companies | | Privately-owned companies | | Overall | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | $\chi^2$ | $\Phi$ |
| Developing communication strategies with social, cultural, and political sensitivity | 3.86 | 1.004 | 4.00 | 0.979 | 3.93 | 9.859[*] | .145 |
| Monitoring public opinion and understanding stakeholders | 3.83 | 0.979 | 3.98 | 1.044 | 3.90 | | |
| Understanding structures of media systems and public spheres | 3.72 | 1.066 | 3.86 | 1.053 | 3.78 | | |
| Hiring and leading local communication experts for the organization | 3.39 | 1.178 | 3.36 | 1.203 | 3.38 | | |

*Notes*: $n^{min} = 450$ heads of communication (CCOs) of companies in Europe. All items are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not challenging) to 5 (very challenging).
[*] $p \leq 0.05$.

**Table 6**
Existing structures and strategies for international communication.

| | Listed companies | | Privately-owned companies | | Overall | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | t | df |
| My organization has solid structures and strategies for international communication | 3.67 | 1.155 | 3.37 | 1.164 | 3.53 | 3.096[**] | 559 |

*Notes*: $n = 579$ heads of communication (CCOs) of companies in Europe. All items are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
[**] $p \leq 0.01$.

*franca* is only a partial solution to the problem; often the majority of employees and even more customers and other stakeholders are not able to communicate in English.

Increasing sensitivity to other cultures and languages may result in the danger of decentering one's own key values. This makes managing communication even more complicated. Developing resilience and preparing their team and the whole corporation to operate in this complex environment is a challenge for global CCOs. In the words of one interviewee:

> A main challenge is the ability to make some cross-company priorities for communication and avoid getting lost in that everything is local. For most companies, markets still have more in common than they are different. So by picking a few key themes/positioning points the company is able to organize an international communications effort; of course with due respect for local differences.
>
> (Head of Global Corporate Positioning, Denmark)

### 4.3. Organization of the international public relations function (RQ3)

Only about a half of CCOs reported solid structures for international public relations operations, with listed companies far ahead of private companies (see Table 6).

Qualitative interviews revealed that CCOs understand the importance of central organization in international communications given the fact that in the digital age local issues might escalate into global ones within seconds. However, European communication leaders seem not to seek to manage local resources and personnel, thus failing to execute "real" control in these areas. According to the global CCOs interviewed, there is a strong tendency for communication to be in control at corporate headquarters with communication being responsible for vision, mission, values, and other "soft" building blocks of a corporation. Losing control over them could endanger corporate identity and consequently reputation. But there are also companies that avoid centralized structures but practice aligned decentralization. In this case, communication leaders and their teams at headquarters usually accept the responsibility for defining the corporate brand and story, global corporate communication standards, and the outline of the organization of the communications function. In European multinational companies, local communication managers and their teams can be given considerable freedom to implement and execute these standards, adjusted to local cultures and circumstances. However, selecting local communications personnel and defin-

**Table 7**
Strategies used to internationalize the communication function.

|  | Listed companies | | Privately-owned companies | | Overall |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | M | SD | M | SD | M |
| Implementing management structures (planning, organization, evaluation) | 3.36 | 1.019 | 3.51 | 1.051 | 3.43 |
| Communicating in multiple languages | 3.26 | 1.283 | 3.32 | 1.194 | 3.29 |
| Enforcing corporate design rules | 3.03 | 1.252 | 3.23 | 1.129 | 3.12 |
| Selecting and working with communication agencies in those countries | 3.06 | 1.106 | 3.16 | 1.199 | 3.10 |

Notes: $n^{min}$ = 451 heads of communication (CCOs) of companies in Europe. All items are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not challenging) to 5 (very challenging).

ing local resources is not a priority for the European CCOs surveyed. Three statements from the qualitative survey represent these views:

> Central structure (with standards and policies) is key! The rest may be democratic, but causes chaos and unwanted "independency" with strange strategies and statements.

> (Head of Corporate Communication, Austria)

> Aligned decentralization: meaning headquarters responsible for the corporate story (vision, mission, values, global strategy, targets), corporate standards (global messages, policies such as corporate design and key-wording); while regional/national communications units should ensure aligned transformation in regional/national/local statements. However; online communications remain global due to the "flat world" we live in.

> (Head of Corporate Communication, Switzerland)

> My approach is decentralized management to be closer to the business, but with clear guidelines and a lot of communication with central organization.

> (Director of Communication, Spain).

### 4.4. Strategies used to internationalize the communication function (RQ4)

Multinationals are internationalizing communication function by implementing traditional management structures (for planning, organization, and evaluation), communicating in multiple languages, enforcing corporate design rules, and complementing their communication departments with communication agencies in host countries (Table 7).

In the qualitative interviews, many CCOs expressed their interest in attracting internationally experienced newcomers. As university education becomes more international and there is increasing student mobility, global CCOs recommend recruiting the best prospective potential employees based on their international experience and performance, replacing a traditional bias towards candidates from the company's home country. They believe that training and enculturating excellent locals pays off: working with good people and bringing them into contact with the best practices and with the best practitioners in headquarters is expected to produce positive results with respondents considering perseverance as the most important factor for success in this respect. There is a tendency to make all communication structures intercultural and global: global CCOs are aware of a need to rethink the whole concept of headquarters (core, home). They see the development of a truly intercultural and globalized communication structure across the corporation as a significant challenge and expect it to bring positive effects both on a local and global level.

### 4.5. The main future challenges for international public relations (RQ5)

According to the qualitative interviews, the interplay between centralization and decentralization in the organization of the communication function will remain one of the major challenges. Integration of communication into general management will make the public relations function responsible for the development of communication competencies at all organizational levels, while public relations specialists will be more responsible for education, training, and "special projects" which need communicational support. Communication functions are expected to move from structures predominantly linked to stakeholders and programs to more integrated approaches. CCOs of some companies expect the communications function to support key change initiatives. In the words of three of those interviewed:

> We will see a move from companies that have communication departments to communicating companies.

> (Head of Communication Services, Switzerland).

> (1) Communication skills and capabilities need to be made part of the skills set of all leaders in the organization.

> (2) Communication training and social media enablement for all employees.

(3) Communication related items will have to be part of values, vision and mission.

(Head of Group Communication, Germany).

The communication function will be shaped by general trends that affect global companies: digitalization, change of customer needs and stakeholder expectations, increased interconnectedness, efficiency expectations as well as increasing emphasis on risk management. Communicators will act as change consultants and project managers. Communication will become more project and topic-related. This will be reflected in the organizational set-up of corporate communications.

(Head of Corporate Communication, Germany).

## 5. Discussion

Corporate public relations in Europe is an international, globalizing practice with non-profit and governmental sectors lagging behind (Zerfass, Moreno, Tench, Verčič & Verhoeven, 2013; Zerfass, Tench, Verčič, Verhoeven, & Moreno, 2014). Nearly, all CCOs in European corporations (more than 90 percent of them) experience international communication as a part of their daily business and nearly a quarter of them regularly work with 20 or more countries. International public relations are therefore very important for European CCOs and it will be even more so in the near future, although a declaration of the death of domestic public relations is premature. The main challenges for international public relations practice result from a growing diversity inside and around global companies and the need to feel it, understand it, and respond to it. Solid structures for international public relations are developed only by half of the surveyed organizations, and they range from full centralization, aligned decentralization, to full decentralization. The major challenge is to find people who are internationally and globally socialized, able, comfortable and willing to work in a cross-cultural setting, and capable of taking international and global public relations practice to a new level of corporate public relations as an essential component of communicative global corporations.

Theoretically, the evidence confirms the *generic principles and specific applications* framework (Verčič, Grunig and Grunig, 1996) and its variations known as *world-class public relations* (Wakefield, 2011) and the *theoretical framework for global public relations* (Sriramesh and Verčič, 2001, 2009): European multinationals cultivate and nurture their core missions, visions, and values centrally, while appreciating diverse economic, linguistic, social, and political realities around the world. Balancing the two extremes seems to be an art they are trying to master. The notion of *cross-national conflict shifting* is present and highlighted by ubiquitous social and mobile media. Yet, although European CCOs underline the importance of international and global public relations practice and Cornelissen et al. (2006) warned about the importance of the way in which communication function is organized, clear structures to support global public relations managerially are often missing. What is needed in terms of research are more in-depth studies of both successful and unsuccessful organizational designs of the global communication function.

What may be the key implications of this research for practice? International public relations is about balancing central authority (not necessarily control) and local independence. A central definition of the framework for communications (positioning, messaging, stakeholder and channel priorities) as well as central processes (planning, resources) are key and need to be aligned with the strategic priorities of the corporation as well as the overall planning process. Diversity and international experience are keys for recruitment and composition of communication professionals in corporate headquarters as well as in decentralized communication teams. Preparing for the future role of international communication means that the competence and authority of the communication team needs to be developed beyond traditional qualifications. This will include improvement in change management competencies as well as general management skills. Companies need to establish a compulsory global planning process with a clear schedule. They must develop global communication initiatives (both with an internal and external focus) to implement key messages and counter most important global issues, using a combination of central development, aligned execution of key projects plus a broad tool box approach to be used by local communicators. They have to establish international training initiatives for communicators as well as an international selection process for communication staff, encourage international exchange of best practices and creative approaches in corporate communications between countries, regions, as well as divisions and functions, and establish a visible international communication performance within the company.

## 6. Limitations and future perspective

This study is limited both by its geographic and sectorial borders. These two limitations interrelate with Taylor and Kent (1999) warning on the assumptions about ways in which public relations are practiced around the world. Although multinationals from what may become the transatlantic free trade area (TAFTA), uniting Europe and North America, are probably the most similar compared to other parts of the world, Wakefield (2000) noted important differences between the US and European practices of international public relations. Therefore, any generalization of results beyond Europe needs empirical verification. It is also important to repeat that this study covers only the corporate sector (private and public, listed companies) and any generalization to NGO's and governmental organizations or agencies needs to be verified.

Limited and purposeful samples, although large for this type of research, also limit the generalizability of results. But findings are informative and there are several directions for future research that the current study warrants. Besides comparing international public relations practices of European multinationals with those from Northern America, there is an urgent need to initiate studies in multinationals from BRICS countries. As they grow bigger and more important on the global scale, it is only reasonable to assume that their practices will have consequences for the international practice of public relations. Another stream of research is needed in comparative research in international public relations between multinationals from countries with large domestic markets (e.g., the US) and those with smaller markets (e.g., Sweden): it is safe to assume that international public relations do not have the same role and importance in both cases. There are probably differences in international public relations between mature, extractive industries (e.g., mining and oil) and young, dynamic industries (e.g., ICT), between industries that are more regulated (e.g., air travel) and less regulated (e.g., tourism), more and less globalized, and so forth.

We have just started to scratch the surface of the phenomenon, but international and global public relations has and will have even more profound effects for the lives of an ever growing number of people on the planet, so we need more and deeper research on its practice

## References

Botan, C. (1992). International public relations: critique and reformulation. *Public Relations Review, 18*, 149–159.

Choi, Y., & Cameron, G. T. (2009). Overcoming ethnocentrism: the role of identity in contingent practice of international public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*, 171–189.

Cornelissen, J., van Bekkum, T., & van Ruler, B. (2006). Corporate communication: apractice-based theoretical conceptualization. *Corporate Reputation Review, 9*, 114–133.

Curtin, P. A., & Gaither, T. K. (2007). *International public relations: Negotiating culture, identity, and power*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Falconi, T.M. (2010). *Global stakeholder relationship governance*. White paper for the Institute for Public Relations. Retrieved from <http://www.instituteforpr.org/topics/global-stakeholder-relationship-governance/>.

Freitag, A. R. (2002). Ascending cultural competence potential: an assessment and profile of U.S. public relations practitioners' preparation for international assignments. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 14*, 207–227.

Gregory, A., & Halff, G. (2013). Divided we stand: defying hegemony in global public relations theory and practice. *Public Relations Review, 39*, 417–425.

Grunig, J. E. (2006). Furnishing the edifice: ongoing research on public relations as a strategic management function. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 18*, 151–176.

Jain, R., De Moya, M., & Molleda, J. C. (2014). State of international public relations research: narrowing the knowledge gap about the practice across borders. *Public Relations Review, 40*, 595–597.

Kleinert, J. (2001). *The role of multinational enterprises in globalization: An empirical overview*. Kiel, Germany: Kiel Institute of World Economics. Kiel Working Papers No. 1069

Molleda, J.C. (2009). *Global public relations*. White paper for the Institute for Public Relations. Retrieved from <http://www.instituteforpr.org/topics/global-public-relations/>.

Molleda, J. C., & Quinn, C. (2004). Cross-national conflict shifting: a global public relations dynamic. *Public Relations Review, 30*, 1–9.

Newsom, D., VanSlyke Turk, J., & Kruckeberg, D. (2001). International public relations: a focus on pedagogy. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 649–658). London, New Delhi: Sage.

Ni, L. (2013). Globalization and public relations. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of public relations* (vol. 1) (2nd ed., vol. 1, pp. 395–396). Thouand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sharpe, M. L., & Pritchard, B. J. (2004). The historical empowerment of public opinion and its relationship to the emergence of public relations as a profession. In D. J. Tilson, & E. C. Alozie (Eds.), *Toward the common good: Perspectives in international public relations* (pp. 14–36). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Sriramesh, K. (2008). Globalization and public relations. In A. Zerfass, B. van Ruler, & K. Sriramesh (Eds.), *Public relations research: European and international perspectives and innovations* (pp. 409–425). Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Sriramesh, K., & Verčič, D. (2002). International public relations: A framework for future research. *Journal Of Communication Management, 6*, 103–117, 2001)

Sriramesh, K., & Verčič, D. (2007). Introduction to this special section: the impact of globalization on public relations. *Public Relations Review, 33*, 355–359.

Sriramesh, K., & Verčič, D. (2009). A theoretical framework for global public relations research and practice. In K. Sriramesh, & D. Verčič (Eds.), *The global public relations handbook: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 3–21). London, New York: Routledge.

Taylor, M. (2001). International public relations: opportunities and challenges for the 21st century. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 629–637). London, New Delhi: Sage.

Taylor, M., & Kent, M. L. (1999). Challenging assumptions of international public relations: when government is the most important public. *Public Relations Review, 25*, 131–144.

The Global Alliance for Public Relations Communication Management. (2010). *The Stockholm accords*. Lugano, Switzerland: The Global Alliance for Public Relations and Communication Management. Retrieved from: www.stockholmaccords.org.

The Global Alliance for Public Relations Communication Management. (2012). *The Melbourne mandate*. Lugano, Switzerland: The Global Alliance for Public Relations and Communication Management. Retrieved from: www.melbournemandate.globalalliance.org.

Verčič, D. (2009). Public relations of movers and shakers: transnational corporations. In K. Sriramesh, & D. Verčič (Eds.), *The global public relations handbook: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 795–806). London, New York: Routledge.

Verčič, D. (2013a). Comparative research in public relations: from european to global research designs. In D. Ingenhoff (Ed.), *Internationale PR-forschung* (pp. 11–20). Konstanz, Germany: UVK.

Verčič, D. (2013b). Intercultural and multicultural context of public relations. In R. Tench, & L. Yeomans (Eds.), *Exploring public relations* (3rd ed., pp. 70–82). London: Pearson Education, Prentice-Hall.

Verčič, D., Grunig, L. A., & Grunig, J. E. (1996). Global and specific principles of public relations: evidence from slovenia. In H. M. Culbertson, & N. Chen (Eds.), *International public relations: A comparative analysis* (pp. 31–66). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Verčič, D., & Grunig, J. E. (2000). The origins of public relations theory in economics and strategic management. In D. Moss, D. Verčič, & G. Warnaby (Eds.), *Perspectives on public relations research* (pp. 9–58). London, UK: Routledge.

Vesala-Varttala, T., & Varttala, T. (2010). Challenges and successes in multicultural corporate communication. In *HAAGA-HELIA Publication series, Discussion 1/2010*. Helsinki, Finland: HAAGA-HELIA University of Applied Sciences.

Wakefield, R. I. (2000). World-class public relations: a model for effective public relations in the multinational. *Journal of Communication Management, 5*, 59–71.

Wakefield, R. I. (2001). Effective public relations in the multinational organization. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 639–647). London, New Delhi: Sage.

9

Wakefield, R. I. (2007). Globalization, glocalisation, and corporate reputation: what does it all mean for multinational entity? In *Proceedings of the 14th International public relations research symposium ?BledCom, Impact of globalization on public relations Bled* Slovenia, 6–8 July.

Wakefield, R. I. (2011). World-class public relations one decade later. *Public Relations Journal, 5*(3).

Zaharna, R. S. (2001). In-awareness approach to international public relations. *Public Relations Review, 27,* 135–148.

Zerfass, A., Moreno, A., Tench, R., Verčič, D., & Verhoeven, P. (2013). *European communication monitor 2013. A changing landscape – managing crises, digital communication and CEO positioning in Europe. Results of a survey in 43 countries.* Brussels, Belgium: EACD/EUPRERA, Helios Media.

Zerfass, A., Tench, R., Verčič, D., Verhoeven, P., & Moreno, A. (2014). *European communication monitor 2014. excellence in strategic communication – Key issues, leadership, gender and mobile media. Results of a survey in 42 countries.* Brussels, Belgium: EACD/EUPRERA, Helios Media.