

---

# Comparing how organisations use websites and social media to maintain organisation–public relationships

---

Michel M. Haigh, The Pennsylvania State University

---

## Abstract

*This study examined the dominant corporate communication strategy employed by organisations on their Facebook pages and websites. Results indicate organisations employ a corporate social responsibility approach on their websites (promote corporate social responsibility activities) and a more corporate ability strategy (emphasise quality of products and services) on their Facebook pages. Results also indicate that organisations discuss forms of internal and external corporate social responsibility more often on their websites than on Facebook. The results support past research that indicates organisations are not taking advantage of the capability Facebook provides to interact with stakeholders.<sup>1</sup>*

## Introduction

Organisations build and maintain relationships via the Internet by disseminating organisational information and promoting two-way communication (Johnson, 1997). Research shows the importance of the Internet and of corporate websites as tools for public relations (Esrock & Leichty, 1998, 2000; Hill & White, 2000; Kent & Taylor, 1998; Kent, Taylor, & White, 2003).

Stakeholders have shifted from visiting organisations' websites to visiting Facebook pages. A Webtrends (2011) study found 68% of the top *Fortune 100* companies have seen a decline in unique (first time visitors) to their websites while 40% of these companies have seen unique visits to their Facebook sites increase. The major reason individuals 'like' an organisation on Facebook is to learn about

specials or sales, and new product features or services (Emarketer, 2010).

It is important to understand the different types of information available to see if there are differences between Web 1.0 and Web 2.0 strategies. Porter (2010) states 70% of journalists use social networking tools to help with stories. He suggests Facebook pages are a good way for organisations to share news and company information, and operate mini, online newsrooms.

Porter (2010) offers a suggestion on how organisations should employ Facebook in their public relations efforts. However, there is little research comparing the types of information organisations make available on Facebook pages compared with their corporate websites. Do organisations duplicate website content on Facebook? Do they include links to stories in Facebook posts? Do organisations vary the types of organisation–public relationship information presented in these two forms of communication?

The study applies the theories of organisation–public relationships, interactivity, and corporate social responsibility. Organisations use websites and Facebook to maintain organisation–public relationships. The dialogic theory of public relations (Kent & Taylor, 2002) emphasises the importance of two-way communication and receiving feedback from an organisation's publics. Kent and Taylor (2002) argue meaningful dialogue with stakeholders is important to relationship-building. This dialogue can take place on Facebook and through channels on an organisation's website.

One way to bolster organisation–public relationships is by practicing corporate social responsibility. Kim and Reber (2008) state corporate social responsibility is "a central

---

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to Brittany Caplin, Katy Reedman, and Emily Stubler who served as undergraduate research assistants while enrolled in the College of Communications.

relationship-building activity” (p. 341). Haigh, Brubaker and Whiteside (2013) found stakeholders’ perceptions of an organisation are more positive after they interact with the organisation’s Facebook page. Additional research showed the type of communication strategy an organisation employs on its Facebook page affects the stakeholders’ perceptions of the organisation–public relationship and corporate social responsibility. In the end, when organisations employ a corporate social responsibility strategy, stakeholders’ perceptions of the organisation–public relationship were stronger than stakeholders who interacted with pages employing a corporate ability strategy focusing on the organisation’s products.

A content analysis was conducted to determine if there were differences in the type of communication strategy organisations were employing on their Facebook page or website. It extended a study conducted by Men and Tsai (2012) by coding websites and Facebook pages for a dominant corporate social responsibility frame, corporate ability frame, or a hybrid approach, something Men and Tsai (2012) did not do. The current study also extends the research by examining different forms of corporate social responsibility information (external or internal) available on the two forms of online communication.

### Literature review

#### *Organisation–public relationship*

In the field of public relations, organisations use communication to build, nurture, maintain, and bolster stakeholder relationships (Bruning & Ledingham, 2000). These relationships are referred to as organisation–public relationships. Broom, Casey, and Ritchey (2000) define organisation–public relationships as “represented by the patterns of interaction, transaction, exchange, and linkage between organisation and its publics” (p. 18). Hon and Grunig (1999) proposed six components of organisation–public relationships including: satisfaction (favourable feelings about the relationship), commitment (decision to

maintain/promote the relationship), trust in the other (integrity, dependability, and competence), control mutuality (power to influence the other), communal relationships (concerned with welfare of the other party), and exchange relationships (equal exchange benefits).

Organisation–public relationships are placed on a continuum. Communal relationships, relationships where both parties receive some sort of benefit, anchor one end of the relationship continuum. Exploitive relationships, when one party takes advantage of the other by not fulfilling an obligation, anchor the other end of the continuum (Hung, 2005). Other types of organisation–public relationships include: contractual relationships, exchange relationships, and win-win relationships. Organisations have different relationships with different publics, but a win-win relationship, when both parties benefit from the relationship, is something most strive for (Hung, 2005).

#### *Interactivity and organisational–public relationships*

Park and Reber (2008) state organisations can use corporate websites to build organisation–public relationships. One key component websites have to include to encourage relationship building is interactivity (Jo & Kim, 2003). Johnson, Bruner, and Kumar (2006) state interactivity adds value to the communication process. There are four parts of interactivity including: *reciprocity*, reciprocal communication; *responsiveness*, responses in the communication interaction solve the need for information; *the speed of response*, and *nonverbal information*, the use of communication via multiple channels (Johnson et al., 2006). If a website is interactive it provides users the opportunity to click on links and buttons, and responds to the user’s need for information (Johnson et al., 2006).

McMillan, Hoy, Kim, and McMahan (2008) state interactivity as a three-dimensional construct including: human-to-computer, human-to-human, and human-to-content. Human-to-computer interaction is usually coded or viewed as navigation (e.g., menu bars and hyperlinks), action (e.g., online surveys or

personalised login) or transaction (conducting business online) (McMillan et al., 2008). Human-to-human interactivity focuses on how humans interact with each other via the technology. For example, organisations allow stakeholders to email them through the site, or have additional ‘Contact Us’ pages. This type of interaction can take place in ‘real time’ or be asynchronous (McMillan et al., 2008). Finally, stakeholders interact and contribute to the content online (human-to-content interactivity) by uploading videos or photos (McMillan et al., 2008).

Organisations’ websites bolster organisation–public relationships through interactivity because stakeholders can provide feedback, email, and connect with content (Jo & Kim, 2003). Stakeholders are not looking for fancy technology to be used in a website, but rather judge the organisation on reputation, community involvement, commitment, and having a satisfactory experience with the organisation (Jo & Kim, 2003). Interacting with an organisation’s website bolsters perceptions of the organisation–public relationship, and after using an organisation’s website, stakeholders found the company socially responsible, and had greater trust in the company (Hong & Rim, 2010).

Organisations are now building social networking sites (SNS) to enhance and build relationships with stakeholders (Men & Tsai, 2012). Men and Tsai (2012) state there are three essential strategies for bolstering or building relationships online: disclosure or openness, information dissemination, and interactivity. Organisations need *disclosure or openness* “direct and open conversation with publics” (p. 724). When organisations practice *information dissemination* they meet “the needs, concerns, and interests of publics” (Men & Tsai, 2012, p. 725). *Interactivity and involvement* promote relationships online (Men & Tsai, 2012). Interactivity is one of the main advantages of using Facebook or other forms of SNSs. Men and Tsai (2012) measured interactivity by the presence or absence of “organisational contact information (e.g. email, phone number,

physical address); navigation (hyperlinks to external content); opportunities for commenting and sharing; action features for SNS engagement (polls, SNS applications, games, quizzes); and whether corporate communicators responded to user comments” (p. 726).

When examining the impact of interacting with Facebook on organisation–public relationships, Haigh et al. (2013) found similar results as Jo and Kim (2003) and Hong and Rim (2010). Stakeholders’ perceptions of the organisation–public relationship significantly increased, and their satisfaction and trust in the organisation became stronger, after interacting with the organisation’s Facebook page.

The current study extends the Men and Tsai’s (2012) and Waters, Burnett, Lamm and Lucas’ (2009) studies by measuring interactivity via a scale measure (Liu, 2003) as well as by the interactivity indicators available. Because Facebook promotes more immediate two-way communication, it should rate higher on interactivity compared with the organisation’s website. This study compares the two different forms of communication (Facebook pages and websites) in order to determine if there are differences in interactivity.

H1: Organisations’ Facebook pages will rate higher on interactivity than their websites.

This study also extends research by Men and Tsai (2012) and Waters et al. (2009) by examining specific public relations information available. Neither of these studies examined if there was something called a media or press kit, the presence of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), fact sheets, biographies, or monetary information available on Facebook. If Porter (2010) is correct and journalists are visiting social network sites such as Facebook to garner this type of information, it is worth examining if that information exists on Facebook, and then comparing it with the types of information available on the corporate website. Journalists are just one group of stakeholders public relations professionals work with in order to garner relationships. The following research question was posed to gain a better understanding of the different types of

information available across different online platforms.

RQ1: Do corporate websites and Facebook pages vary in the presence of media kits, fact sheets, biographies, monetary information, and FAQs available?

#### *Corporate social responsibility*

Jo and Kim (2003) found that organisation–public relationships are bolstered when websites discuss an organisation’s community involvement. Community involvement is one form of corporate social responsibility. Kim and Reber (2008) state corporate social responsibility is “a central relationship-building activity” (p. 341). There are three types of corporate social responsibility activities including: relational (e.g., striving to build long-term relations with its consumers), discretionary (e.g., contributing resources to raise social awareness of issues, and supporting children and family issues), and moral/ethical (e.g., acting responsibly toward the environment) (David, Kline, & Dai, 2005). Corporate social responsibility perceptions are moderated by consumers’ responses to the type of corporate social responsibility activity an organisation is participating in as well as quality of the product (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001).

Corporate social responsibility activities can take a variety of forms including: *inputs*, internal behaviours and processes, and outputs (Waddock & Graves, 1997). Inputs include the organisation investing in environmental strategies and equipment to prevent pollution or other environmental factors. *Internal behaviours and processes* include how the organisation treats women and minorities, the types of products produced; and *outputs* refer to behaviours most consumers are aware of: community relations programmes, philanthropic programmes, and how the organisation tries to do good in the community (Waddock & Graves, 1997). Corporate social responsibility can also be grouped as an external or internal effort (Basil & Erlandson, 2008). External activities involve “[c]ause-related marketing, charitable donations, event sponsorship, and

employee volunteerism” whereas internal corporate social responsibility activities “relate to internal policies and codes of conduct that may or may not actually be practiced. Examples include having a code of ethics, having health and safety policies, and having responsible environmental policies”. (pp. 128–129)

Basil and Erlandson (2008) examined websites from 159 companies that ranked in Canada’s Top 1000. The longitudinal analysis (2003, and again in 2006) showed the number of organisations discussing corporate social responsibility on their websites sites had increased. Basil and Erlandson (2008) found a significant increase in the number of organisations displaying codes of ethics, and presenting health, safety, and environmental policies on their websites.

Kim and Rader (2010) examined *Fortune 500* organisations’ websites for corporate social responsibility focused communication strategies, corporate ability focused communication strategies, and the hybrid strategy where organisations promote both corporate ability and corporate social responsibility information. They found most organisations employed a corporate ability frame. Kim and Rader (2010) concluded the corporate social responsibility strategy was becoming more prominent among the top 100 *Fortune 500* corporations, but the corporate ability strategy was more prominent when examining all *Fortune 500* corporations.

Stakeholders judge the organisation on reputation, community involvement, commitment, and having a satisfactory experience with the organisation more so than how interactive the organisation’s website is (Jo & Kim, 2003). Neither Waters et al. (2009) or Men and Tsai (2012) studied the differences or presence of corporate social responsibility information on websites and Facebook. Haigh et al. (2013) found when organisations discuss corporate social responsibility on their Facebook pages, stakeholders’ attitudes, perceptions of corporate social responsibility, and purchase intent increased. Employing a corporate social responsibility strategy on Facebook led to stakeholders’ having more

positive perceptions of the organisation–public relationship and corporate social responsibility efforts. Understanding the different types of corporate communication strategies employed and the emphasis on corporate social responsibility will provide a better understanding of how these online forms of communication impact the organisation–public relationship. This study asks:

RQ2: Do organisations employ different communication association strategies (e.g., corporate ability, corporate social responsibility, or hybrid) on their websites and Facebook pages?

RQ3: Is there a difference in: a) the amount, and b) the type (e.g., external and internal) of corporate social responsibility available on an organisation’s website versus its Facebook page?

## Method

### *Sample*

The Reputation Institute in conjunction with the Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship developed the corporate social responsibility index (CSRI). The CSRI is the combined average of the general public’s perceptions along the three key dimensions: citizenship, governance, and workplace. The 230 companies measured in the United States for Reputation Institutes’ 2010 Global Reputation Pulse Study and the Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship were included in the current study because they scored the highest on the CSRI.

### *Procedures*

Coders located the organisation’s website then coded it for the information included in the variables coded section below ( $N = 230$ ). Coders then found an official Facebook page maintained by the organisation. Coders did not code pages without information or those not maintained by the organisation. They examined the posts on the Facebook wall, the tabs, and the information presented as a whole ( $N = 133$ ). To ensure recent and past posts were examined, coders read through the

posts and clicked on ‘older posts’ until they had read through the posts on the Facebook wall. Facebook pages were coded for the same information as the websites.

### *Coders and training*

Three students enrolled at a Mid-Atlantic University conducted the content analysis. Coding norms were established during a supervised training session. Thirteen percent of the sample ( $n = 30$ ) was randomly selected and coded independently for training. After inter-coder reliability was calculated, coders coded the rest of the sample independently. Holsti’s (1969) formula was used to assess inter-coder reliability for nominal level data (80–95% agreement for nominal level categories); and inter-coder reliabilities of .80 to .95 (Rosenthal 1984, 1987) for the interval level data examining corporate social responsibility and interactivity.

### *Variables coded*

#### *Organisation–public relationships*

Organisation–public relationship cultivation was coded by employing categories established by Waters et al. (2009) and Men and Tsai (2012). The same categories were coded for Facebook pages and websites. *Organisational disclosure* was assessed by the presence of: description of the organisation’s programs and services, organisational history, mission statement, link or address to organisation’s website, and logo (Waters et al., 2009). Three categories were added for the current study: page indicating presence of a legal statement, link to Twitter, and a link to a blog. Coders indicated ‘yes’ or ‘no’ depending if the information was present on the website. The categories were repeated and coded for the organisation’s Facebook page.

*Information dissemination* was evaluated by determining whether there were links or posted news items, photographs, video files, audio files, and press releases (Waters et al., 2009), presence of information or documents about achievements, awards, corporate social responsibility reports, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), a contact person, and monetary information (Chaudhri & Wang, 2007). Because this study was comparing the differences in types of public relations

materials present, the following categories were also included: some indication of 'press/media' tab or section, presence of a media kit, fact sheets, and biographies. Coders indicated 'yes' or 'no' depending if the information was present on the website and the organisation's Facebook page.

*Involvement* was assessed by the answering 'yes' to nominal categories previously employed by Waters et al. (2009). Categories included: email address of the organisation, phone number, calendar of events, volunteer opportunities, presence of a company's wall posts, posts by others, and a discussion forum or message board.

*Interactivity* of the page was measured by six questions on five-point, interval-level scales (Liu, 2003). The six questions used in the study asked: "The organisation is effective in gathering visitors' feedback through the website/Facebook page", "it is easy to offer feedback to the organisation", "this website/Facebook page facilitates two-way communication between the stakeholders and the organisation", "the website/Facebook page makes me feel the organisation wants to listen to its stakeholders", "the website/Facebook page does encourage visitors to talk/interact", "the website/Facebook page gives stakeholders the opportunity to talk back." The scale reliability was  $\alpha = .97$ .

#### *Corporate social responsibility*

*Corporate social responsibility* was measured by a five-item, five-point, interval-level scales. The questions were adapted from Lichtenstein, Drumwright and Braig (2004) and included: "the organisation is committed to using a portion of its profits to help non-profits", "the organisation gives back to the communities in which it does business", "local non-profits benefit from the organisation's contributions", "the organisation integrates charitable contributions into its business activities", "the organisation is involved in corporate giving." The scale reliability was  $\alpha = .98$ .

Corporate social responsibility was also measured by nominal level categories measuring internal and external corporate

social responsibility information. *Internal CSR information* was measured by three categories: *code of ethics* (e.g., a guiding set of principles/ethical standards were available), *environmental policy* (e.g., a policy discussing environmental impact conservation), and *health and safety information* (e.g., the company had a specific health and safety policy in place) (Basil & Erlandson, 2008). Statements and documents for each category had to be specifically mentioned or present on the website or Facebook page.

*External CSR* was measured by coding for the 'presence' of four types of information: *employee volunteerism* (the employees volunteer locally), *charity donations* (the organisation donates to local charities), *sponsorship of events* (the organisation sponsors local events), and *cause-related marketing* ("the company teams with a cause or non-profit, making a donation for every purchase or transaction" (Basil & Erlandson, 2008, p. 32)). Statements for each category were specifically mentioned or present on the website or Facebook page.

## **Results**

This study examined how corporate Facebook pages and websites differed in the types of information available for journalists and stakeholders in regards to general organisation information, corporate social responsibility information, and opportunities for interactivity.

To examine H1, which stated Facebook pages would rate higher on interactivity than organisations' websites, an ANOVA was computed for the independent variable, website or Facebook page, and the dependent variable of interactivity. Results indicated no significant differences in the degree of interactivity between an organisation's website and its Facebook page  $F(1, 358) 1.64, p > .10, \eta^2 = .01$ . Facebook pages ( $M = 3.19, SD = .94$ ) rated slightly higher on interactivity than organisations' websites ( $M = 3.07, SD = .81$ ). Therefore, the pattern of means supported the idea that social networking tools such as Facebook may be more interactive than websites; however, there were no significant differences.

**Table 1. Organisation–public relationship information available on organisations’ Facebook pages and websites**

<b>Organisational disclosure</b>	<b>Websites</b>	<b>Facebook</b>	<b>Chi-Square</b>
	<b>(N = 230)</b>	<b>(N = 133)</b>	
Programmes/Services	195 (32)	106 (27)	2.36
Organisational history	212 (14)	84 (49)	55.00*
Mission statement	198 (27)	86 (47)	28.40*
Link or website address		124 (7)	
Logo	133 (0)	224 (3)	4.18
Legal statement or conduct on Facebook		89 (44)	
Link to Twitter feed	130 (97)	66 (67)	1.98
Link to blog	80 (147)	27 (106)	8.96*
<b>Information dissemination</b>			
Links to news items	186 (41)	86 (47)	13.98*
Photographs	141 (86)	127 (6)	50.01*
Video files	133 (94)	96 (37)	6.75*
Audio files	139 (88)	11 (122)	96.81*
Press releases	217 (10)	21 (112)	238.40*
Info about achievements/awards	187 (40)	51 (82)	72.58*
Corporate social responsibility reports	200 (27)	27 (106)	165.51*
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)	190 (37)	22 (11)	156.24*
A contact person	204 (23)	27 (106)	176.52*
Monetary Information	204 (23)	12 (121)	228.39*
Indication of press/media section	200 (27)	7 (126)	235.52*
Media kit	120 (107)	4 (129)	92.32*
Fact sheet	174 (53)	4 (129)	181.96*
Biographies	193 (32)	8 (125)	217.66*
<b>Involvement</b>			
Email address	169 (59)	15 (118)	133.93*
Phone number	202 (24)	33 (100)	155.15*
Calendar of events	156 (71)	73 (60)	6.94*
Fan wall posts		86 (47)	
Company wall posts		128 (5)	
Discussion forum		94 (39)	

The number of these things coded as ‘yes’ is indicated. The ‘no’ is in parentheses.

\* indicates there is a significant difference between websites and Facebook pages.

Chi-Square analyses were employed to examine RQ1 which asked if corporate websites and Facebook pages vary in the presence of media kits, fact sheets, biographies, monetary information, and FAQ information. The analyses indicated significant differences for the presence of:

*media kits*  $\chi^2 (1, N = 360) = 92.31, p = .000$ , *fact sheets*  $\chi^2 (1, N = 360) = 181.96, p = .000$ , *biographies*  $\chi^2 (1, N = 360) = 217.66, p = .000$ , *monetary information*  $\chi^2 (1, N = 360) = 228.40, p = .000$ , and *FAQs*  $\chi^2 (1, N = 360) = 156.24, p = .000$  when comparing corporate Facebook pages and websites. See Table 1.

RQ2 asked about the different communication strategies (e.g., corporate ability, corporate social responsibility, or hybrid) employed on corporate websites and Facebook pages. A Chi-Square analysis indicated significant differences  $\chi^2(2, N = 358) = 38.28, p = .000$  for the type of strategy employed on corporate Facebook pages and websites. Corporate websites were more likely to use a corporate social responsibility approach ( $n = 142$ ) compared with Facebook pages ( $n = 46$ ). On the other hand, Facebook pages ( $n = 58$ ) were more likely to employ a corporate ability approach than websites ( $n = 35$ ), and more websites employed a hybrid approach ( $n = 48$ ) than Facebook pages ( $n = 29$ ).

RQ3 asked about the amount and types of corporate social responsibility available on websites and Facebook pages. An ANOVA was computed for the independent variable of corporate website or Facebook page and the dependent variable of score on corporate social responsibility measures. Results indicated there was a significant difference in the amount of corporate social responsibility information available  $F(1, 358) = 30.42, p = .001, \eta^2 = .08$ . Corporate websites ( $M = 3.43, SD = .95$ ) had more corporate social responsibility information available than Facebook pages ( $M = 2.81, SD = 1.16$ ). Organisations publish more

corporate social responsibility information on their websites than on their Facebook pages.

To examine the second part of RQ3, Chi-Square analyses were conducted to examine the nominal level categories of corporate social responsibility. *Internal corporate social responsibility* was measured by the presence of the following types of information: codes of ethics, environmental policy, and health and safety information. Significant differences were found for internal corporate social responsibility information available on corporate websites or Facebook pages: codes of ethics  $\chi^2(1, N = 357) = 141.77, p = .000$ ; environmental policy information  $\chi^2(1, N = 357) = 124.70, p = .000$ ; and health and safety information  $\chi^2(1, N = 357) = 113.03, p = .000$ .

*External corporate social responsibility* was measured by the presence of information about employee volunteerism, charity donations, sponsorship of events, and cause-related marketing. Significant differences were found for information about employee volunteerism  $\chi^2(1, N = 357) = 69.11, p = .000$ , charity donations  $\chi^2(1, N = 357) = 46.79, p = .000$ , and sponsorship of events  $\chi^2(1, N = 357) = 45.91, p = .000$ . Therefore, external corporate social responsibility information varies when comparing organisations' Facebook pages and websites. See Table 2.

**Table 2. Corporate social responsibility information available on organisation's Facebook pages and websites**

	Websites	Facebook	Chi-Square
<b>Internal corporate social responsibility</b>	<b>(N = 230)</b>	<b>(N = 133)</b>	
Code of ethics	192 (34)	28 (103)	141.77*
Environmental policy	186 (40)	30 (103)	124.70*
Health and safety information	175 (50)	27 (107)	113.03*
<b>External corporate social responsibility</b>			
Employee volunteerism	188 (38)	54 (79)	69.11*
Charity donations	197 (29)	73 (60)	46.70*
Sponsorship of events	187 (39)	65 (68)	45.91*
Cause-related marketing	45 (181)	24 (109)	.19
<b>Scale measures</b>			
Corporate social responsibility	3.43 (.95)	2.81 (1.16)*	

The number of these things coded as 'yes' is indicated. The 'no' is in parentheses.

\* indicates there is a significant difference between websites and Facebook pages.

## Discussion

This study examined the differences in the information available on an organisation's website versus its Facebook page. It extends the literature by comparing the types of information available in order to gain an understanding of how these forms of online communication may impact on organisation–public relationships. Online relationships can be built through disclosure/openness, information dissemination, and interactivity/involvement (Men & Tsai, 2012).

H1 found limited support for the idea that social networking sites such as Facebook are more interactive than websites. Men and Tsai (2012) argue organisations are now building social networking sites to enhance and build relationships with stakeholders, and social networking lends itself to be more interactive. The current study employed a scale measure to see if there were differences in the amount of interactivity. Coders developed guidelines to determine the amount of interactivity based on the frequency of interactions between the organisations and the stakeholders. They were able to determine the frequency of interaction by scrolling through the Facebook posts. Men and Tsai (2012) state “corporate communicators need to embrace SNSs with a ‘no post left behind’ mentality to cultivate dialogic communication and meaningful relationships with their strategic publics” (p. 729).

In the end, the current results confirm previous results by Bortree and Seltzer (2009), Waters et al., (2009), and Men and Tsai (2012) that organisations are not taking full advantage of the interactivity social networking sites provide. Kent and Taylor (2002) emphasise the importance of two-way communication and receiving feedback from an organisation's publics. They argue meaningful dialogue with stakeholders is important for relationship building. This dialogue can take place on social media sites—both with and without the organisation's involvement.

Research shows community colleges have not fully utilised the dialogic opportunities offered by the Internet (McAllister-Spooner, 2008; McAllister-Spooner & Kent, 2009), and anecdotal evidence offers support that a number

of organisations, including Dell (Hart, 2010) and Domino's Pizza (Evangelista, 2009), failed to utilise the dialogic features offered through social media whereas a content analysis of Toyota's corporate Facebook page during its 2010–2011 vehicle recall found the organisation responded to customers' comments on their social media sites (Byrd, 2012). In this study, organisations were not fully utilising the interactivity built into social networking services because the human-to-human interactivity (how humans interact with each other via the technology) is lacking.

Less than 10% of Facebook pages included any type of public relations materials on Facebook (e.g., media kits, fact sheets, biographies, etc.). RQ1 found significant differences for the presence of media kits, fact sheets, biographies, monetary information, and FAQs available on corporate websites than Facebook pages. If Porter (2010) is correct and journalists are visiting social network sites such as Facebook to garner this type of information, then they are left without it. Since more stakeholders, including journalists, are visiting Facebook first instead of an organisation's website, they miss the fact sheets, biographies, FAQs, and monetary information available on a corporate website. The lack of organisational performance information could impact users' perceptions of information dissemination, meaning the organisation may not meet “the needs, concerns, and interests of publics” (Men & Tsai, 2012, p. 725). Stakeholders are not looking for fancy technology, but expect to be able to form an opinion about the organisation based on the information provided online (Jo & Kim, 2003).

RQ2 asked about the different communication association strategies (e.g., corporate ability, corporate social responsibility or hybrid) employed on websites and Facebook pages. For example, when an organisation promotes corporate social responsibility activities, it employs a corporate social responsibility focused communication strategy. When the organisation emphasises quality of products and services, it employs a corporate ability focused communication strategy. Another communication strategy identified was the hybrid strategy. Organisations use this

approach when promoting both corporate ability and corporate social responsibility information (Kim & Rader, 2010).

Results indicate corporate websites were more likely to use a corporate social responsibility frame than Facebook pages. Facebook pages employed more corporate ability frames compared with websites, and more websites employed a hybrid approach. These findings for Facebook replicate what Kim and Rader (2010) found for corporate websites. However, Haigh et al. (2013) found when organisations employ a corporate social responsibility strategy on Facebook, stakeholders' perceptions of the organisation–public relationship, corporate social responsibility and purchase intent were higher when compared with stakeholders exposed to Facebook pages employing a corporate ability or hybrid approach. This corporate social responsibility strategy fits better with how individuals use Facebook, namely to start and maintain relationships.

RQ3a found corporate websites have more corporate social responsibility information available than Facebook pages. RQ3b found significant differences for the types of corporate social responsibility available including internal corporate social responsibility information (codes of ethics, environmental policy information, and health and safety information), as well as external corporate social responsibility information (employee volunteerism, charity donations, and sponsorship of events). Thus overall, websites have more corporate social responsibility information available.

### **Limitations and future directions**

There is still more to learn about Facebook and communicating with stakeholders. More effects studies are needed to determine the impact of corporate websites, Facebook pages, and other forms of social networking sites on organisation–public relationships. For example, are stakeholders who expect an organisation to comment on their post turned off when the latter does not comment? Research could also compare differences in stakeholders'

perceptions about an organisation after they interact with a website and a Facebook page. The type of information and format in which it is presented is different, so the impact on stakeholders may also vary. Also, if journalists are relying on social media to garner information, it is worth asking them what they expect to find there since the current study indicates there is a lack of 'typical' media information (e.g., biographies, fact sheets, FAQs)?

### **Conclusion and practical implications**

This study wanted to extend the literature by examining the different types of corporate social responsibility information available on corporate websites and Facebook pages, as well as determine if organisations employed different communication association strategies (e.g., corporate ability, corporate social responsibility, or hybrid) on websites and Facebook pages. It is important to understand how organisations are framing information on websites and Facebook pages because it impacts how stakeholders respond to the organisation. Facebook was created to maintain and build relationships, and the corporate social responsibility approach 'fits' that idea better than a corporate ability approach.

This study provides public relations professionals with guidelines on how to craft messages for Facebook and websites. In the end, organisations have moved to a corporate social responsibility frame on their websites, but they need to employ that type of frame on Facebook in order for social media to have a positive impact (Haigh et al., 2013). Professionals need to develop strategies to take advantage of the interactivity social media services provide. Human-to-human interactivity, or communication between the organisation and stakeholders, is still not fully realised on social networking services. Practitioners can develop social media plans to bolster interactivity to fully utilise social media services and produce effective messages to strengthen organisation–public relationships.

## References

- Basil, D. Z., & Erlandson, J. (2008). Corporate social responsibility website representation: A longitudinal study of internal and external self-presentations. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 14*(2), 125–137. DOI: 10.1080/13527260701858497.
- Bortree, D., & Seltzer, T. (2009). Dialogic strategies and outcomes: An analysis of environmental advocacy groups' Facebook profiles. *Public Relations Review, 35*(3), 317–319. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.05.002.
- Broom, G., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (2000). Toward a concept and theory of organisation–public relationships: An update. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 73–93). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Bruning, S. D., & Ledingham, J. A. (2000). Perceptions of relationships and evaluations of satisfaction: An exploration of interaction. *Public Relations Review, 26*(1), 85–95. DOI: 10.1016/S0363–8111(00)00032–1.
- Byrd, S. (2012). Hi Fans! Tell us your story!: Incorporating a stewardship-based social media strategy to maintain brand reputation during a crisis. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 17*(3), 241–254. DOI: 10.1108/13563281211253502.
- Chaudhri, V., & Wang, J. (2007). Communicating corporate social responsibility on the Internet: A case study of the Top 100 information technology companies. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*(2), 232–247. DOI: 10.1177/0893318907308746.
- David, P., Kline, S., & Dai, Y. (2005). Corporate social responsibility practices, corporate identity, and purchase intention: A dual process model. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*(3), 291–313. DOI: 10.1207/s1532754xjpr1703\_4.
- Emarketer (2010). Report available at: <http://www.emarketer.com/Article.aspx?R=1007476&AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1>.
- Esrock, S. L., & Leichty, G. B. (1998). Social responsibility and corporate web pages: Self-representation or agenda setting? *Public Relations Review, 24*(3), 305–319. DOI: 10.1016/S0363–8111(99)80142–8.
- Esrock, S. L., & Leichty, G. B. (2000). Organisation of corporate web pages: Publics and functions. *Public Relations Review, 26*(3), 327–344. DOI: 10.1016/S0363–8111(00)00051–5.
- Evangelista, B. (2009, May 3). How Domino's responded to prank video. *San Francisco Chronicle, p. D1*.
- Haigh, M. M., Brubaker, P., & Whiteside, E. (2013). Facebook: Examining the information presented and its impact on stakeholders. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 18*(1), 52–69. DOI: 10.1108/13563281311294128.
- Hart, L. (2010). Social media. In J. Doorley & H. F. Garcia (Eds.), *Reputation management: The key to successful public relations and corporate communication* (pp. 112–133.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hill, L., & White, C. (2000). Public relations practitioners' perception of the World Wide Web as a public relations tool. *Public Relations Review, 26*(1), 31–51. DOI: 10.1016/S0363–8111(00)00029–1.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations*. The Institute for Public Relations Commission on PR Measurement and Evaluation, Gainesville, FL.
- Hong, S. Y., & Rim, H. (2010). The influence of customer use of corporate websites: Corporate social responsibility, trust, and word-of-mouth communication. *Public Relations Review, 36*(4), 389–391. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.08.002.
- Hung, C. F. (2005). Exploring types of organisation–public relationships and their implications for relationship management in
- Haigh, M. M. (2014). Comparing how organisations use websites and social media to maintain organisation–public relationships. *PRism 11*(2): <http://www.prismjournal.org/homepage.html>

- public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17(4), 151–176. DOI: 10.1207/s1532754xjpr1704\_4.
- Jo, S., & Kim, Y. (2003). The effect of web characteristics on relationship building. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 15(3), 199–223. DOI:10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1503\_1.
- Johnson, G., Bruner, G., & Kumar, A. (2006). Interactivity and its facets revisited: Theory and empirical test. *Journal of Advertising*, 35(4), 35–52. DOI:10.2753/JOA0091-3367350403.
- Johnson, M. A. (1997). Public relations and technology: Practitioner perspectives. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 9(3), 213–236. DOI:10.1207/s1532754xjpr0903\_02.
- Kent, M., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web. *Public Relations Review*, 24(3), 321–334. DOI: 10.1016/S0363-8111(99)80143-X.
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 28(1), 21–37. DOI: 10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00108-X.
- Kent, M., Taylor, M., & White, W. (2003). The relationship between web site design and organisational responsiveness to stakeholders. *Public Relations Review*, 29(1), 63–77. DOI: 10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00194-7.
- Kim, S., & Rader, S. (2010). What they can do versus how much they care: Assessing corporate communication strategies on Fortune 500 web sites. *Journal of Communication Management*, 14(1), 59–80. DOI: 10.1108/13632541011017816.
- Kim, S., & Reber, B. H. (2008). Public relations' place in corporate social responsibility: Practitioners define their role. *Public Relations Review*, 34(4), 337–342. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2008.07.003.
- Lichtenstein, D. R., Drumwright, M. E., & Braig, B. M. (2004). The effect of corporate social responsibility on customer donations to corporate-supported nonprofits. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4), 16–32. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.4.16.42726>.
- Liu, Y. (2003). Developing a scale to measure the interactivity of websites. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 43(2), 207–216.
- McAllister-Spooner, S. M. (2008). User perceptions of dialogic public relations tactics via the Internet. *Public Relations Journal*, 2(1), 1–18.
- McAllister-Spooner, S. M., & Kent, M. L. (2009). Dialogic public relations and resource dependency: New Jersey community colleges as models for web site effectiveness. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 17(4), 220–239. DOI: 10.1080/15456870903210113.
- McMillan, S. J., Hoy, M. G., Kim, J., & McMahan, C. (2008). A multifaceted tool for a complex phenomenon: Coding web-based interactivity as technologies for interaction evolve. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(4), 794–826. DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2008.00420.x.
- Men, L., & Tsai, W-H. (2012). How companies cultivate relationships with publics on social network sites: Evidence from China and the United States. *Public Relations Review*, 38(5), 723–730. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.10.006.
- Park, H., & Reber, B. H. (2008). Relationship building and the use of the Web sites: How Fortune 500 corporations use their Web sites to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 34(4), 409–411. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2008.06.006.
- Porter, J. (2010). Facebook for public relations. Available at: <http://www.prweekus.com/the-use-of-social-media-is-no-longer-a-question-of-if-but-how/printarticle/149590/>
- Rosenthal, R. (1984). *Meta-analytic procedures for social research*. Sage: Beverly Hills.
- Rosenthal, R. (1987). *Judgment studies: Design, analysis, and meta-analysis*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 225–243. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.225.18838>.

Waddock, S., & Graves, S. (1997). The corporate social performance–financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(4), 303–319. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199704)18:4<303::AID-SMJ869>3.0.CO;2-G.

Waters, R. D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., & Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, 35(2), 102–106. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.006.

Webtrends. (2011). <http://blogs.webtrends.com/>

#### **Author contact details:**

Correspondence can be sent to [mmh25@psu.edu](mailto:mmh25@psu.edu).

Contact Haigh at 814.863.3850, 103 Carnegie Building, University Park, PA, 16802.

#### **Copyright statement:**

The author of this article has elected, in the interests of open dissemination of scholarly work, to provide this article to you in open access format. This means that, in accordance with the principles of the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.soros.org/openaccess/>), you may freely copy and redistribute this article provided you correctly acknowledge its author and source, and do not alter its contents.