"World-Class" Public Relations One Decade Later: Does the Model Still Apply?

Robert I. Wakefield

In the past decade, virtually everything and everyone in the world has been affected by the forces of globalization—including the public relations industry and the organizations its practitioners serve. These dynamics have particularly affected the transnational corporations and other organizations whose operations and stakeholders reach far beyond their nations of origin. The evolution from the domestic to the global has increased the challenges for public relations units in these organizations as they respond to the global economy; the pervasive social technologies; varying cultures and regulations of different nations; the increasing interconnections and frictions of diverse societies; time zone challenges; and many other complex factors. Falconi (2010) asserted, "It is today increasingly evident that communication … may no longer be approached from a local, national, regional or even an international perspective, but only from a global one, even if and when its activities are local" (p. 2).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Given the dynamics of globalization, it may seem like the need for any local or domestic communication has gone away, but that is not yet the case. There still are millions of smaller entities—community institutions, local hospitals or care centers, public school systems, and such—that exist all over the United States and in other nations whose main publics and daily communication concerns are limited to a fairly small realm of activity. Of course, all organizations *can* encounter communication from anywhere in the world—even if just the random display of interest from afar or one person or group from any number of nations using the computer as an attack platform. But these possibilities seem much different from the constant realities faced by organizations that have physically extended their operations into many nations, with multiple offices or divisions, thousands of employees, and other resources scattered around the world. Those transnational entities definitely require global coordination, but they have hardly left any need for local communication in the rearview mirror.

Molleda (2009) argued that the truly transnational organizations must account for much greater complexity than the smaller, domestically focused organizations. These entities that maintain a worldwide reach and presence need to know how to organize and operate their public relations programs on a truly global basis. Best practices and theoretical frameworks can help to generate such an understanding. Verčič (2003) stressed not only the need but also the value of theory building that specifically targets the global arena. He stated: "Corporate public relations in the world stage is the forerunner of the best in public relations

… therefore, to study the best in public relations we need to focus on transnational public relations" (p. 487).

Despite these dynamics faced by global practitioners, theoretical research to guide their efforts is not keeping up with the need. Molleda and Laskin (2005) argued that just a few scholars have generated theory that looks specifically at global public relations. Only fifteen years ago, information on how to communicate and build relationships across national borders consisted mostly of anecdotal treatises (Wakefield, 1997). In an attempt to guide theory building, Culbertson and Chen (1996) distinguished between *comparative studies,* which compare and contrast public relations from country to country, and *international research* of public relations practices in specific transnational entities. Molleda and Laskin (2005) added another category, the *global* realm, in which public relations effects are not limited to a few nations but occur on a worldwide basis. They then analyzed 700 articles and chapters in the field from 1990 to 2005 and concluded that international research is insufficient. They observed that: (1) more than half of the treatises published in the name of *international public relations* are "not international in its truest sense" (p. 3) but simply compilations of descriptive studies in individual nations; and (2) "scholarship focused on the international issues such as public relations by multinational corporations [or] by supranational organizations … is rare" (p. 3).

This article attempts to address this critical need for research that focuses on the global organization. However, rather than devising something new, the article revisits one of the scarce theoretical frameworks already created specifically to help guide global public relations programs: *the model of "world-class" public relations*. The model was first published 11 years ago (Wakefield, 2000) and later was outlined in Heath's (2001) handbook of public relations (Wakefield, 2001; see also Molleda 2009; Verčič, 2003; and J. Grunig & L. Grunig, in process). Drawing its theoretical foundation from the principles of "world-class" business (Kanter, 1995) as well as the "theory of excellence" in public relations management (J. Grunig, 1992) and its theoretical offshoot, the generic/specific theory of global public relations (J. Grunig, 2006; Wakefield, 1997), the model was then strengthened through research into the public relations structures and practices of 25 transnational firms headquartered in twelve different nations (Wakefield, 2000).

Because a full decade of globalization has passed since publication of the "world-class" model—bringing with it myriad changes and implications for public relations practitioners and scholars—this chapter examines to what extent the model may still be applicable in today's world. Such a reexamination is important for the public relations field because, as Wright and Hinson (2010) have argued, public relations lacks adequate theoretical fortitude because of the dearth of longitudinal research in the field. This is particularly true when it comes to the global realm of practice. While this study is not an actual replication of the original research on the "world-class" model, it does satisfy certain longitudinal

characteristics by reexamining the model one decade after inception to determine its potential for continued application in the field.

The "world-class" model should warrant assessment as to its continued relevance given Falconi's (2010) recent advocacy of the generic/specific theory upon which it was founded. The model also has been incorporated into other theoretical treatises (J. Grunig & L. Grunig, in process). Theoretical significance can be ascertained from the collective wisdom of experts in a given field. For example, to begin a chapter on global public relations in their textbook, Newsom, Turk and Kruckeberg (2007) noted, "The combined experiences of your authors represent 18 countries… in which they have lived and worked. Most of what is included here comes from firsthand experiences" (p. 346). A similar gathering of expertise is likewise appropriate for Delphi studies that attempt to forge consensus or understanding around an emerging phenomenon (Delbecq, et al., 1975), such as global public relations was in the 1990s. Therefore, a Delphi approach was used to begin the research leading to the model.

While this study did not repeat the Delphi for a current assessment of the model of world-class public relations, it did again gather collective knowledge from recognized experts in global management of the practice. The expertise was harvested in a textual analysis of 2009 and 2010 editions of *Frontline Online*, the bi-monthly journal of the International Public Relations Association (IPRA). Although treatises on global practice exist in other publications, this study focused solely on *Frontline Online* because it has a singular focus on international practices and thus promises a more global representation of experts than other publications in the field. All of the articles in *Frontline Online* were written by practitioners who have actual experience with a worldwide scope of influence over public relations. For this project, every *Frontline* article written over this 16-month period was examined and then comments were collected from 27 of the articles that related specifically to the practice of public relations across national boundaries. The comments were then categorized according to the various principles of the model of "world-class" public relations to help determine the model's current relevance.

The remainder of this article, therefore, introduces this model for managing global public relations. It explains the theoretical roots of the model and its various elements: structuring of public relations in global organizations, communications between a worldwide public relations staff, response to publics of various nations, and the like. Then the article explores factors of globalization that may have impacted this model in the past decade: the expansion of the Internet, the concurrent spread of activism, and the changes in traditional mass media. Next, it introduces the comments from *Frontline Online* articles related to the different elements of the model. The paper concludes with an assessment of today's expanding environment of public relations.

Theoretical Foundations for Managing Global Public Relations
As mentioned, most of the early writing on international public relations was more anecdotal than scholarly (Angell, 1990; Epley, 1992; Nally, 1991); nevertheless, much of that discussion was patterned after inquiries in international business on how to balance global and local imperatives faced by organizations operating around the world (Adler et al., 1986; Baalbaki & Malhotra, 1993). Anderson (1989) noted a preference among the authors toward one of two poles: (1) establishing standardized programs at headquarters and implementing them in all markets with minor adaptations, or (2) allocating resources and giving autonomy to local markets where native communicators best understood their publics. Yet, in practice, adhering to either of these poles could be seen as problematic. Centralization could impose programs that were inappropriate for local conditions (Botan, 1992). Complete local autonomy suggested that the transnational perceived little need to protect its reputation through global consistencies. Because there was insufficient communication between central and local public relations units, whenever problems surfaced somewhere in the world there was no way for the organization to respond rapidly or to avoid the spread of the problem to other places—thus risking "a public relations disaster" (Kinzer & Bohn, 1985, p. 5).

Some authors proposed that transnational entities must respond to *both* global and local demands. Wilcox et al. (1989), for example, set an original framework by defining the practice of public relations across national borders as "the planned and organized effort of a company, institution, or government to establish mutually beneficial relations with the publics of other nations" (p. 395).Traverse-Healy (1991) said that international public relations should centralize policies and messages and then create strategies to adapt to local language, customs and politics. He offered suggestions for reaching this balance. Morley (2002) added that "a good product, service, or communications strategy can achieve global success as long as it is customized to meet local tastes" (p. 29).

If, in fact, the right combination of standardization and localization was needed for successful global public relations programs, the key was to discover how that combination should be weighted in order to be most effective. Potential answers to this puzzle were contained in a few related models. The first was Brinkerhoff and Ingle's (1989) *theory of structured flexibility*, created for the development management domain. It suggested a combination of factors that were *generic* to effective global management—that could be universally applied—and those that affected *specific* local contingencies. The generic realm included overall objectives and strategic plans, consensus on policies, and establishment of responsibilities. The specific allocated flexibility to implement the broader themes in specific regions or countries. Another relevant model was the study on Excellence in Public Relations Management, which identified variables that contribute to excellent public relations practice in any given organization (J. Grunig, 1992). Much of the Excellence Model was drawn from theories that had

originated or had been accepted outside the United States, so it was believed that the model could serve as a valuable point of departure for an exploration into international practice (Verčič, et al., 1996).

Throughout the 1990s, scholars from the University of Maryland and other parts of the world devised a foundation for excellence in global public relations based on the above models. The project borrowed the distinctions from Brinkerhoff and Ingle (1989), and then incorporated fourteen variables from the Excellence Study into propositions for global effectiveness. These propositions were called the *generic/specific theory* of public relations (J. Grunig, 2006; Verčič, et al., 1996; Wakefield, 1997). To put it briefly, the eight generic variables proposed that a transnational organization should continually foster trust and interaction from publics worldwide; that public relations implements strategic communication at headquarters *and* in each local unit; that an integrated public relations staff cooperates with but is not subordinated to marketing, legal, or other functions; that all public relations officers worldwide are trained in strategic thinking; and that public relations is structured to rapidly adapt and respond to threats and opportunities anywhere in the world that could affect the entity's reputation. The specific factors that were seen as affecting local markets were level of development, the political and cultural environment, language differences, the potential for activism, and the mass media.

These generic/specific propositions were tested subsequently through four initial studies which combined the wisdom of close to eighty public relations experts in thirty countries. The first research project out of the University of Maryland was a Delphi involving 23 expert practitioners or scholars from eighteen nations (Wakefield, 1997). This was followed by a survey of experts in twelve more countries, replicating an instrument from the original Delphi. Then, in 1999, Wakefield (2000) conducted a project for Edelman Public Relations that investigated the philosophies and activities of 25 transnational corporations from 12 countries using the Excellence variables as the measuring stick. Meanwhile, James Grunig and Lauri Grunig took the generic/specific model to Slovenia and, with their colleague Dejan Verčič, tested applicability of the variables and found them to hold even in newly emerging democracies (Verčič, et al., 1996). All of these projects led to the model for effective global public relations.[1]

Global Excellence: Model of World-Class Public Relations
With the data from these studies above, it was possible to suggest what comprises public relations excellence in global organizations. Certainly, there is no overriding prescription that fits every organization operating around the world. Entities will always differ in philosophy and structure depending upon the industry in which they operate, their culture of origin, size and financial resources, and other factors. However, the authors of the studies argued that they disclosed certain universal basics that could give transnational organizations of any type a broad guidebook for successful public relations.

---

[1] For more detailed explanations of these studies, see Verčič, et al., 1993; and Wakefield, 1997 and 2000.

The name of the "world-class" model was borrowed from international business. In her book *World Class*, Kanter (1995) noted that successful transnational entities incorporate the best thinking and resources from anywhere in the world, not just from the home country. She referred to such entities as *cosmopolitan*. Evidence of a cosmopolitan organization, she said, is that its headquarters staff will look something like the United Nations rather than a "good-old boy" club from Ohio. Believing that successful global public relations should be similarly composed, Wakefield (2001) used the term "world-class" for the model of global public relations effectiveness.

The world-class model highlighted the posture discussed above toward balancing the global and the local. The model apparently was premised on the belief that neither exclusive standardization nor autonomy was appropriate for a comprehensive global public relations program. Standard catch phrases like "think global act local" (Morley, 2002, p. 29) also seemed insufficient. Rather, as stated in subsequent writing, an effective global program needed to *think globally and locally* and *act globally and locally* —all at the same time (Wakefield, 2009). With that foundation, the model then identified six important factors of effectiveness for a global public relations program, as follows:

1. ***Purpose***—a program that emphasizes relationships and preservation of the entity's reputation instead of just a product marketing or messaging focus;

2. ***Executive support***—the extent to which senior management supports public relations through appropriate positioning, budgeting, and resources;

3. ***Staffing and teamwork***—placement of qualified public relations people in all units around the world and structuring them into a horizontal global team, sharing information and strategic input rather than being structured as a top-down, imposed work force;

4. ***Training***—adequate education in public relations or a related field of all public relations staff members around the world;

5. ***Communication style***—whether communication was based on simple one-way dissemination of messages or the more effective two-way interaction and information sharing with both internal and external publics so as to build positive relationships with these publics; and

6. ***Response preparedness***—the extent to which a public relations staff is prepared to anticipate and rapidly respond to any issues or crises that may arise anywhere in the world.

In addition to these six categories, the model suggested that local public relations officers should support line managers in their own offices or divisions; but these same local officers also were seen as integral to a global team that cooperates closely to build understanding of the organization and to help preserve its reputation worldwide. Such a structure is based on the premise that every staff member, no matter where he or she is in the world, brings valuable competencies and ideas to the global strategic table. Wakefield (2000) said it can be a tremendous waste for an organization to hire qualified practitioners in all local units only to restrict their activities to adapting and carrying out global vision set by someone else. It is much better to harness the ideas and input of these diverse personnel into the entire global strategic team.

The model also advocated for this global team to be integrated worldwide into a horizontal planning and implementation capacity, while simultaneously having each individual carry out her or his local assignments according to the global strategies established by the entire team. The initial studies showed that such an arrangement offered the best basis for effective global public relations programs. Molleda (2000) conducted a subsequent study which concurred that most transnational entities reflect some balance between centralized coordination and local flexibilities. The global public relations team determines this balance. Generally speaking, any effective team has a leader—formal or informal—and cooperates closely as an integrated unit.

Wakefield's study (2000) noted that the leader of a global public relations team needs to maintain daily access to the organization's senior executives. However, Molleda's (2000) study indicated that control from headquarters is not necessarily a prerequisite for effective team performance. He also stated that the global team need not be integrated—that different people on the team may report to different line functions in the entity, with individuals in one unit reporting directly through public relations, and others through marketing, human resources, or other functions. However, caution should be exercised toward this view because the more units public relations people report through, the more they can become subject to competing priorities or managerial whims throughout the organization. Such a situation could be beneficial (by bringing divergent reasoning to the table) or harmful (by bogging the team down in disagreements and conflicting priorities), depending on the worldviews of the senior managers and the public relations people in those units, and also depending on the willingness of all of those people to negotiate compromises when needed.

New Influences since Inception of the Model
In the decade since the model was formulated, globalization has influenced public relations practices across borders in several ways. The first is an alteration from traditional, center-to-periphery notions of globalization into what Sirkin, Hemerling, and Bhattacharya (2008) call *globality*. Rather than transnationals all housed in the U.S. or Europe, with business models pushing them into other

parts of the world, global entities today can be headquartered anywhere, with business pushing in all directions. For example, on the most recent list of *Fortune Global 500* companies, 112 of the firms are based outside of the United States, Western Europe, or Japan (money.cnn.com, 2009).

The three other factors influencing public relations are the advent of the Internet and its resulting social media, changes in the reach and power of activism, and the nature of traditional mass media. Given these influences, one might reason that an updated model of global public relations must be quite different from previous models. However, as the following discussion shows, it is not a given that these forces have changed the basic nature of communication and relationship building that balances global and local imperatives.

Influence of the Internet
The Internet has penetrated the developed world and reaches into some of the most remote villages, fostering unprecedented communication opportunities and vulnerabilities for global organizations. It has spawned the spread of social media, where transparency is demanded and any one individual can wreak havoc with the click of a mouse, as Nestle learned when anti-palm oil activists virtually hijacked its Facebook pages this year (Van Camp, 2010). The Internet serves as another information conduit for organizations, an opportunity for connecting with constituents, and a watchdog against organizational behaviors— worldwide, at any given time, and initiated from anyplace (Chester & Larson, 2005).

The sweeping influence of the Internet and social media tempts scholars and practitioners alike to assert that domestic public relations no longer exists Falconi, 2010). Some say that all public relations is global in large part because the reach of the Internet is global (Sriramesh, 2003). However, this idea of all things global is debatable. De Jong, Shaw, and Stammers (2005) argued that "the stark facts of global inequality are as evident with access to the Internet as they are in any other area of human life. In the advanced world … the Internet is an integral part of the life of millions of people. But for millions of others outside of these charmed regions it is simply absent" (pp. 43-44). Of course, in the five years since that statement was made the Internet has reached farther into the corners of the world to where it now is accessed by two billion people—but that still leaves more than five billion people, or more than two-thirds of the world's population, without any access (Internet Statistics, 2011). Perhaps this is why Chang (2010) advocated caution about thinking that the Internet eliminates local imperatives:

> Although the Internet has indeed created a global network society, content tends to be locally oriented…. It is often argued that globalization has rendered the traditional nation-state less relevant than before in global communication…. Such argument is neither theoretically compelling nor empirically sustainable (p. 13).

So, what does the social media environment mean for public relations? It is easy to board the Internet bandwagon. But public relations officers in every entity should remember that social media are still tools of communication, and need to be seen from a larger strategic perspective. Ovaitt (2010) explained this well:

> In the age of Facebook, perhaps "old school" ideas like face-to-face aren't *passé* after all. Even when so-called "digital natives" use technology to track each other, isn't the objective often a meeting point? As a baby boomer, I don't recall ever being referred to as a "telephone native," yet we too used that technology to facilitate real world relationships. There's a message here for organizations that want to build relationships…. Social media strategy? Of course that's important, more so every day…. Just remember that the social network infrastructure will be a part of everything going forward—integrated into society, business and all other organizations (p. 1).

Changes in Traditional Media

Like everything else, traditional media also seem to be globalizing. With satellites connecting every part of the globe (de Jong et al., 2005) and with networks like the British Broadcasting Corporation, Cable News Network, Al-Jazeera, CCTV and TV Globo penetrating the world in multiple languages, media are escaping traditional restrictions and moving into the global sphere. Bagdikian (2004) noted that the number of corporations dominating the media marketplace declined from 50 firms in 1983 to just ten in 2000 and a "big five" today.

Again, however, several scholars see this so-called globalization of media is overblown. De Jong, Shaw, and Stammers (2005) stated, "The evidence contradicts this" (p. 40). As an example, they noted that CNN "is simply too U.S.-oriented," (p. 40), and that both CNN and the BBC, as well as the elite newspapers of the world, access only small numbers of consumers in most nations. Likewise, Tunstall (2008) argued that "the global potential for mass media is … strong, especially if we focus only on technologies …. However, the global export potential for mass media content—movies, TV series, news stories—is inevitably lower…. Most people around the world prefer most of the time to be entertained and informed by people from their own culture and nation" (p. 5).

These changes in the Internet and the influence of these changes on traditional media raise questions. With the global reach and instantaneous nature of the Internet, public relations officers should create centralized messaging and response strategies to ensure communication consistency and readiness of response (as has always been the case as traditional media have dominated global communications). At the same time, local practitioners must connect with

local publics who access the Internet but expect dialogue within local cultural and political frameworks. Is the same true of working with traditional media, where monitoring and messaging should be at both the global and the local levels? Should efforts be made to address communication to both the Internet and traditional media? All of these questions should be considered in global public relations.

The Tide of Activism
Activism also has become global. The Internet has helped activist groups become more interconnected and powerful, and they insist that mainstream entities satisfy their expectations (Falconi, 2010; Friedman, 2000). Before the Internet, activism in one location could be hidden from the rest of the world. Today, this is impossible; information over the Internet spreads in minutes or even seconds. Activist groups have become proficient at rallying other like-minded groups to help apply pressure on governments, transnational firms, and even other interest groups.

Of course, international activism has always been a bit unbalanced. Activism flourishes in some cultures while in others it can be nonexistent—sometimes as a natural cultural constraint and other times from government restriction. Yet, Friedman (2000) described how activists from around the world now go into the inactive countries to pressure for change, exerting great influence against governments and transnational firms that are perceived to abuse local citizens. Friedman called this cross-border process *globalution*, or revolution from outside of the pressured nation. A natural extension would be to view these activists as *globalutionaries* (Wakefield, 2008).

Falconi (2010) recently explained the influence of activism on public relations: "The increasing pressure of these publics on the organization mandates that organizations at least listen to them, and to better communicate with them" (p. 3). While Falconi is not alone in this observation, he added that the art of listening is not new to public relations; however, Internet publics are perhaps forcing public relations people away from today's typical one-way mode of messaging and back into the relationship building roles that form the very roots of public relations practice.

One question related to global structuring is where the point of interaction between activist publics and organizations should occur. The original generic/specific theory proposed activism as a specific variable, thus implying contact at the local level (Vercic, et al., 1996). Is it possible, though, that the forces of globalization and the Internet have changed that condition? Does activism now demand attention from headquarters, with carefully developed global strategies that accommodate continuing communication at the local units, as well? From where does communication with activist groups need to originate—headquarters or local units, or both?

Does the Global Model Apply Today? A Textual Analysis
As mentioned, this study was conducted through a qualitative textual analysis of IPRA's *Frontline Online* journal. All of the articles from 2009 and into the first part of 2010 were scanned, and those that seemed most focused on public relations in the transnational organization were analyzed. First, the study analyzed comments about potential global influences on the practice in the past decade. Other comments were then grouped into the various elements of the world-class model: emphasis on relationships and reputation; executive support and adequate public relations qualifications worldwide; teamwork and information-sharing that fosters listening and dialogue; and response to threats or opportunities that arise anywhere in the world. The study also poked at whether a balance of the global and the local is still needed in a transnational program and, if so, how the balance is achieved. All of the pertinent comments could not be included in the space allocated here, but representative quotes from these various issues are highlighted.

The comments quoted below include more than 25 senior practitioners from various regions, and thus should somewhat reliably represent the opinions of experts around the world about global public relations. The *Frontline* articles from which these comments came are all online and public, and so it seemed appropriate to include their quotes here, by name. Some of the authors are noted more than once. For each quote, the monthly edition of the journal in which it appeared is included in parentheses, so as to distinguish these textual analyses from other references in this article. Page numbers are not included because most of the *Frontline* articles were less than a full page and the quotes are easy to find within the given article. Also, when British spellings are used in a given *Frontline* article, these spellings have been left intact in their replications below. A complete listing of the *Frontline* articles cited here can be seen in Table 1.

First Area of Analysis: Changes in the Global Environment
At this point, the idea that there have been mind-boggling global changes likely is beyond debate. One of these changes mentioned earlier is the transition away from the notion of global imperialism—diffusion of innovations from the center out to a "needy" periphery (although that transition is far from complete). In one *Frontline* article Molleda (April 2009) alluded to this idea of globality mentioned earlier (Sirkin, et al., 2008), reminding IPRA readers that communication no longer flows from east to west but campaigns can come from any country into the global spectrum.

Two other authors also observed this movement toward globality. Bleeker (February 2009) said, "International businesses have expanded into the Middle Eastern region for years. Now it is great to see that a growing number of companies are successfully expanding from this region into the rest of the world." Cambie and Ooi (August 2009) added that the transition offers public relations people a greater advisory capacity in their organizations: "With multinationals from emerging economies becoming increasingly active in the global mergers

and acquisitions arena, communicators from these markets are experiencing the need to educate their senior management on more strategic forms of [public relations]," they said.

Second Area of Analysis: The Influences of Technology
Naturally, the impact of technology on public relations was the overriding theme for many of the articles. As Soutus (April 2010) said: "Messages now zip around the world in the blink of an eye. Local issues are more frequently morphing into global issues. Company reputations and brands are built, debated and scrutinized by hordes of online bloggers and citizen journalists. Millions of stakeholders organize and discuss issues on new social media platforms."

The Internet also seems to be reflecting the globality movement. Kobeh (June 2009) explained, "Latin American content is for the first time spreading outside of the region through the Internet and even influencing the attitudes of readers in other countries, and not the other way around." Hepworth (Oct 2009) added: "Out in the remotest part of Kenya, in a tribal village, a young man who was showing us how to make fire from sticks held up his mobile phone as I showed him my blackberry." She said that the Kenyan government tried to ban television coverage of recent national elections, "until they realised that across the country word was being spread by people armed with technology. It totally changed the dynamics." Kobeh (June 2009) noted similar dynamics when the H1N1 virus first broke out in Mexico. "While the mass media was reporting on the situation every two hours," she wrote, "those on Twitter were posting updates on-the-go, literally informing the public and Internet addicted youth by the minute…. This new digital economy has suddenly changed the dynamics of news reporting, and … in Latin American countries people have embraced it at the same time as in developed ones."

Bach (April 2009), suggested that these dynamics change the way transnational organizations disseminate information. Discussing media placement of research from the University of Copenhagen, she said:

> An interesting difference between our national and international press work is that we usually focus on newspapers, radio or television when reaching out to the Danish media, but when it comes to getting international press coverage we tend to focus on internet [sic.] media (e.g. news sources and blogs). One reason is that there are an enormous amount of international blogs or news-resources that focus on a particular branch of research…. This means even complex research news that would be difficult to place in a daily newspaper has a life on the web where it targets those particular audiences (researchers, investors) that have an interest in a specific subject.

Third Area of Analysis: The Global and the Local
A majority of the articles contained comments about the need to balance global and local programming of public relations. No articles contained any argument for eliminating this need. Tunheim (April 2010), speaking as an external consultant, said:

> For any of us charged with providing and delivering effective strategies to build brands and reputations, it has become imperative that we become—or have access to—world-class glocal organizations. We must be well-prepared 'on the ground' in every particular market, with their unique attributes and challenges; <u>and</u> we must be expert in monitoring and managing the powerful dynamics making the world ever smaller, with ever-more interdependence."

Importance of the Local
Comments representing the continuing need to respect the local and rely on local public relations staff came from virtually every region of the world, including comments about such a need even in Europe and the United States. Typical comments included:

> Gergova (Aug 2009): In today's interconnected world, with news and information flowing 24/7, with every communications expert having instant global reach, it is even more important to understand local culture and behaviour.

> Faku (June 2009): Many corporations who have extended successfully into Africa share some stories of unsuccessful entries, national nuances and faux pas that have sometimes left a sour aftertaste to an otherwise sweet deal. Most express the need for a credible public affairs operation that supports them, interpreting and navigating the national nuances that have the ability to turn stable markets into civil war almost overnight.

> Cheung (Feb 2009): Asia is a hugely complicated and fragmented region. To treat it as one market and to deploy a blanket approach in your PR communications, without regard for the many different markets all with different laws, customs, political and financial infrastructure is a sure way to be dismissed as irrelevant and insensitive.

> Wahlen (June 2009): We can recommend calling in a local Belgian firm because you will find people in-house with the necessary experience of communicating in a complex market.

Wells (April 2010), speaking about transnational organizations in the United States: "Global companies coming here need to be careful not to make the same mistakes —or even worse errors— that U.S. companies have made abroad. After all, the United States is a foreign country, too. And just because you may know a lot of Americans, that doesn't mean you know America.

Cosby (June 2009) noted problems that can arise when practitioners mistakenly believe that the English language can be used in the same way around the world, without thought to localization. "English must be understood within the context of the culture in which it is being spoken," she said. "If not, a ticking bomb of misunderstanding that may lead to possible though unintentional insult is sure to go off during implementation of the strategy in the international market." Ehrhart (June 2009) explained how local differences lead to variances in specific strategies. He said, "Our external communications activities vary across the region, and are tailored to our business needs. In emerging markets, we focus on brand building, largely through editorial outreach. In more developed markets … our external communications serves to educate and showcase the services we provide."

Need for global standards and consistencies
While the local is seen as important, these specific applications of the generic/specific concept will be ineffective and could even increase vulnerabilities unless the applications are couched within a broader global framework. A few authors noted this critical need for overall global standards and consistencies to guide the public relations efforts around the world. For example, Seaman (April 2010) said, "As the economy improves … firms are realising that they have to operate according to international standards." However, he also warned that standards can be seen as "bossy and arrogant" if they are generated too narrowly by only a few who represent the dominant culture of the organization's headquarters.

Some of the authors viewed the global/local balance as sort of a continuing loop, where the global frameworks cannot be considered without the potential local imperatives, nor the local without the global umbrella. These were stated as follows:

Shimmin (Feb 2010): If your local agency says "that won't work here," believe them, but ask what will? Insist only that the core attributes get communicated and allow the periphery to sway with local relevancy.

Thornton (Feb 2010): Keep an open mind as you begin to consider and plan for global strategic and local tactical execution. While headquarters may lead the charge in most global business plans, it

is the regional and country operations that will truly validate the concept and legitimize the strategy behind those plans.

Fourth Area of Analysis: Elements of the World-Class Model
After an exploration of the influences of globalization and the issue of balancing the global and the local, the study examined comments specifically related to the six elements of the world-class model that are listed earlier in this chapter. Representative comments are highlighted below.

Focus on relationships and reputation over marketing support
This factor could be considered as controversial because so much of public relations today seems to center on product promotion and supporting the organization's "megamarketing mix" (Hutton, 2001). In fact, it could be argued that with the myriad additional avenues provided by the Internet to disseminate information, the field is increasingly moving in this promotional direction (at least in the U.S., as Falconi, 2010, argued). Interestingly, in the *Frontline Online* articles I reviewed, there was little evidence that any of these authors support that notion of public relations. Rather, representative comments focused more on the need for the function to complement the overall reputation of the organization through stakeholder engagement.

Edelman (April 2009) put forward the strongest argument for stakeholder relations. "It is now time for business to embrace partnership with government and other stakeholders to assume societal acceptance," he said. "There is support for a broader role of the corporation, beyond the Milton Friedman aphorism that the only job for business is to generate profit." Hardie (Feb 2009) added a similar view: "Communications should differentiate and transform reputations. It should lead to change that can be valued because it creates a hard reputational dividend. Because it allows companies to expand faster, gain access to resources previously unattainable or simply to be more valuable in the eyes of investors. That's what should make communications strategically important."

Thornton (Feb 2010) also emphasized relationships. "Stakeholder engagement means hearing the value in what the stakeholders—both internally and externally—have to say and responding in a creative, proactive and measurable way," she said. She especially emphasized the need to cooperate with other internal functions, encouraging. practitioners to "develop linkages with other global support functions for accountability and transparency—after all, you are all part of the same company with similar goals."

Support from top executives
Certainly if public relations complements the organizational mission and works to retain its trust among constituents, the function should receive support from the entity's top executives. Without that fundamental support, it becomes difficult for public relations officers to be effective in their global strategic programs.

Nevertheless, there was no discussion in the IPRA articles about the need for this executive support. Two authors, however, discussed the importance of educating top management about the critical role of public relations. Bleeker (Feb 2009) explained, "As communicators it is our role to educate our leadership and management about the rules of engagement when communicating globally and this includes setting realistic expectations." Thornton (Feb 2010) added that this education process should take place in all units throughout the world. "Start with building support among local management for the communications function, assess regional business needs—and then gain alignment on the overall company vision as well as regional and local country business and communications objectives," she said.

Training and expertise in public relations globally
Only a few of the authors discussed any need for educational development to build more consistent qualifications among practitioners worldwide. Thornton (Feb 2010), for example, advised senior public relations officers to "play an essential role in recruiting the best talent in regional and country roles—as top communicators are essential building blocks for driving the communications function and positioning it strategically in the eyes of management."

Many nations still have far to go to nurture adequate qualifications. For example, Badaro (April 2009) said, "Many international [public relations] agencies got into the Egyptian market between 2004 and 2006…. Many, but not all, are not in my opinion equipped to offer services beyond media relations, media training, event management, etc. When it comes to reputation building and strategic brand positioning, you would be better advised … to turn to a PR agency abroad." Speaking of Ukraine, Pankratieva (April 2009), added, "In-house people sometimes are professional, sometimes not. It depends on the company. The same is true with agency people."

One author pointed out that even senior executives need continuing education as the field faces new global dynamics. Soutus (April 2010) explained, "For those of us that have worked for years in communications, this is like nothing we have ever done. It means learning something new despite our years of experience. It also means leaving a comfort zone to confront an emerging reality that is not going away."

Staffing and teamwork
Once the right staff members are positioned in the various markets, how they cooperate toward mutual goals is crucial. Three authors commented on this:

> Thornton (Feb 2010): Language and cultural differences notwithstanding, applying effective business communications is universal in that common corporate direction and goals are needed. How global communications programs achieve those goals are typically the culmination of extensive relationship building and

> meaningful engagement with a company's regional and country communicators.
>
> Bleeker (Feb 2009): Internal communications becomes more and more critical as part of the corporate communications mix. Your local talent can help make or break you in a new territory and I believe they should be targeted first when it comes to corporate communications.
>
> Shimmin (Feb 2010): Good ideas don't follow trade winds, they can spark up anywhere and good brand-builders bounce them around other markets.

Thornton (Feb 2010) noted how teamwork can be effective. She advised:

> Every team has a leader, in one form or another, sometimes as a result of a direct reporting relationship or indirectly through a matrix-reporting relationship—or in some organizations a combination of both….Regional and country communicators need to be appreciated for their collaboration and value—and should be recognized as being part of the extended global communications team…. The process is multi-pronged as there is a defined process for sharing information and results through individual update calls, weekly conference calls, frequent country visits, global communications meetings and informal gatherings.

Communication style that emphasizes listening and dialogue
Several of the authors discussed the importance of dialogue and listening. For just one example, IPRA's past president Robert Grupp (April 2010) reported from the 2008 PR World Congress in Beijing. He said: "This World Congress illustrated that we are rather tightly interconnected in today's world…. We heard many examples of how dialogue is the new communications. We rededicated ourselves to encouraging open, honest, authentic dialogue among our client companies and stakeholders."

Issues preparedness and response mechanisms
A major purpose for all of the above elements of a global public relations program is to preserve reputation. Part of this preservation calls for anticipating and avoiding crises, or being prepared to respond to crises when they inevitably arise. Some organizations have suffered the consequence of trying to perform all of their communication activities in the right way, only to face an unanticipated crisis anyway. Nevertheless, the world-class model suggested that organizations should do everything possible to put into place an early (or perhaps constant) warning system, to communicate regularly with stakeholders so as to build trust and, as much as possible, mitigate the potential for crisis. They also must communicate rapidly and consistently through any issue that comes, recognizing

that the issue will not be contained to any one locale. Several authors spoke of this crisis preparedness and two are represented here:

> Hunt (Feb 2010): "Social media such as Facebook, YouTube and Twitter allow consumers to take control and demand that brands take notice of them. The recent Eurostar crisis—five trains broke down in tunnels shortly before Christmas—and the tragic earthquake in Haiti demonstrate the power of Twitter to create a single powerful voice that can complain (in the case of Eurostar) and foster collaboration for enormous good (in the case of Haiti). …. Brands that were previously unconvinced of the need for a social media strategy for crisis management and other purposes now realise they have nowhere to hide. If a brand's consumers are using these channels to talk to and complain about the brand, it has no choice but to take part in these conversations.

> Shimmin (Feb 2010): Use every resource to gain early warning of problems and speed your response through scenario planning…. Stop and think about how your actions in one country will affect opinion in another.

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this article was to address the scarcity of theory specific to public relations in global organizations by reintroducing and reassessing the model of world-class public relations. Interestingly, Falconi (2010) recently proposed a "new" framework for global public relations—one based not on a "communicating-to" (p. 9) or one-way message dissemination approach which he said dominates public relations today, but based on the more fundamental principles of stakeholder relations and dialogue. In Falconi's own words, "This framework is the *generic principles and specific applications* one" (p. 10). Yet, the "new" model he proposed is not new at all. The generic/specific theory was developed almost two decades ago (J. Grunig, 2006), and the model of world-class public relations described in this chapter represents an extension of that theory. This model, too, has been in public relations literature for a decade.

The article outlined a qualitative study intended to add insight into whether the world-class model is still applicable in today's environment of instant and omnipresent globalization. It acknowledged that the recent influences of globalization—the Internet, social media, and their resulting possibilities for constant exchange—have definitely affected the way public relations people conduct communications with their various publics. But the study also indicated that some of the fundamentals of global public relations programs, the ways its officers structure and carry out their programs, have not changed much despite the dramatic differences in global communication.

From the *Frontline* articles, it appears that the model has *not* been shown to *not apply* in today's world. It is possible that one researcher examining a series of articles, as was done in this study, can overlook those comments which could negate the basic assumptions of given research project. In this case, however, there was a careful attempt to find representative comments supporting or opposing each element of the model. But rather than finding direct oppositional statements, the review at most found no mentions to specifically support some of the elements. For example, there were no comments saying that senior executives should not support public relations in global organizations, while one comment only inferred that such support should exist. None of the articles opposed the concept of building relationships and some explicitly mentioned stakeholder engagement as an important foundation for the practice. No one explicated that global teamwork is a bad idea, while others specifically advocated it. Many stated that while the global is a critical organizational framework, the local is still an integral part of the organizational execution and is not to be ignored.

Like all studies, this one has limitations—particularly given that it was no more than a qualitative review of articles in only one journal by one researcher. It can be argued that the sampling of articles was inadequate, even though more than 25 articles were found on the subject of public relations in global organizations. It also is possible that because the authors are senior practitioners and the articles are advisory in nature, the comments thus recorded here focus not on the daily realities of the practice but on more of what Molleda and Laskin (2010) called the normative approach to global practice.

It may be possible to claim that global public relations is too broad and complex for any one-size-fits all model to apply across the board. Yet, like the study on excellence in public relations management and the generic/specific theory, the model of world-class public relations was not intended as a specific prescription; instead, it provided broad guidelines for achieving success through a variety of adaptations (Wakefield, 2001). For example, few practitioners would reject the need for support from and some form of contact with top executives to help achieve public relations goals. How exactly that is carried out is up to interpretation of specific entities. Likewise, teamwork is most likely seen broadly as desirable; yet, as Molleda (2000) noted, the way this teamwork is framed within specific organizations is subject to adaptation—and some may not agree that integration into one unit is ideal for certain organizations. Also, most practitioners would likely advocate better training across the globe, and entities like IPRA and the Global Alliance for Public Relations Management are constantly fostering that outcome.

It seems appropriate, then, to reinforce the model of world-class public relations as a useful theory for global public relations management—one worthy of continued discussion. The model advocates global consistencies and cooperation but eschews top-down, centralized management approaches. It also

preserves the need to apply communication principles and stakeholder engagement at both locally and globally, in accordance to Falconi's (2010) current admonitions. Yet the model also offers enough flexibility to accommodate different philosophies and structures of organization and communication. What the model does most is to encourage organizations to enact a structure that accommodates both global and local demands, which utilizes all the public relations talent available around the world for its program, and at the same time encourages listening, issues anticipation, and global flexibility.

In today's context, global public relations is not just a matter of what to do at the global level and what else to carry out locally, as though each level operates in some separate universe. Instead, it should be considered a *global fusion of competencies and creativity* in all areas of the public relations function throughout the organization. Many organizations today have public affairs, media relations, community relations, product publicity, and other related functions in separate silos, geographical units, or divisions. Others have combined them all, but under a marketing communication umbrella. It is possible that both of these philosophies can be problematic—the first because the various functions are not coordinating activities enough to maintain the consistencies necessary for effective relationship building, and the second because the focus of communication then becomes the consumer—and often only the consumer.

From a normative standpoint, then, perhaps a few assertions could be made. What is needed inside the transnational entity is for all relationship building functions to work cooperatively as equal team members, with information sharing, input, idea banks, issues anticipation and all other functions performing equal, horizontal roles. These should be guided by a team leader who has constant access to and complete support from senior executives, a great listening mindset, and an ability to encourage and persuade. When this global team is supported by senior executives of the organization, positioned in the decision making ranks at both the global and the local levels, with necessary budgets and resources, the opportunity for effective programming of global public relations should significantly increase. From there, the public relations officers should be focused on communicating with external constituents in a dialogic manner, using technologies not just as information dissemination tools but as mechanisms for listening to publics, understanding their desires and concerns, and entering their conversations to create the mutually beneficial relationships that are so necessary to effective public relations.

REFERENCES

Adler, N., & Doktor, R., with Redding, S. (1986). From the Atlantic to the Pacific century: Cross-cultural management reviewed. *Journal of Management*, 12, pp. 295-318.

Anderson, G. (1989). "A global look at public relations," in B. Cantor (ed.), *Experts in action*, 2nd ed. (pp. 412-422). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Angell, R. (1990). "'International PR': A misnomer," *Public Relations Journal*, 46(10), p. 8.

Botan, C. (1992). "International public relations: Critique and reformulation," *Public Relations Review, 18*(2), 149-159.

Baalbaki, I., & Malhotra, N. (1993). Marketing management bases for international market segmentation: An alternate look at the standardization/customization debate. *International Marketing Review, 10*(1), pp. 19-44.

Bagdikian, B. (2004). *The new media monopoly*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Brinkerhoff, D., & Ingle, M. (1989). "Between blueprint and process: A structured flexibility approach to development management," *Public Administration and Development, 9*(5), pp. 487-503.

Chang, T.K. (2010). Changing global media landscape, unchanging theories?: International communication research and paradigm testing. In G.J. Golan, T.J. Johnson, & W. Wanta (Eds.), *International media communication in a global age* (pp. 8-35). New York: Routledge.

Chester, J., & Larson, G. (2005). Sharing the wealth: An online commons for the non-profit sector. In R. McChesney, R. Newman, & B. Scott (Eds.), The *future of media: Resistance and reform in the 21st century* (pp. 185-205). New York: Seven Stories Press.

Culbertson, H.M., & Chen, N. (1996). *International public relations: A comparative analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

DeJong, W., Shaw, M., & Stammers. N. (2005). *Global activism, global media*. London: Pluto Press.

Delbecq, A.L., Van de Ven, A.H., & Gustafson, D.H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes.* Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman.

Epley, J. (1992). "Public relations in the global village: An American perspective," *Public Relations Review*, 18(2), pp. 109-116.

Falconi, T.M. (2010, April). *Global Stakeholder Relationship Governance*, White paper for Institute for Public Relations.

Friedman, T. (2000). *The Lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Anchor Books.

Grunig, J.E. (1992). *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grunig, J.E. (2006). Furnishing the edifice: Research on public relations as a strategic management function. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *18*(2), 151-176.

Grunig, J.E., & Grunig, L.A. (in preparation). Characteristics of excellent communication. Chapter in T.L. Gillis (Ed.), *Inside Organizational Communication*, 5th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Heath, R.L. (2001). *Handbook of public relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hutton, J.G. (2001). Defining the relationship between public relations and marketing. In R.L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 205-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Internet Statistics (2010). "Internet usage statistics: The Internet big picture, world internet users and populations stats."

Kanter, R. (1995). *World class: Thriving locally in the global economy*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kinzer, H., & Bohn, E. (1985). "Public relations challenges of multinational corporations." Paper presented to the International Communications Association Conference, Honolulu, HI.

Morley, M. (2002). *How to Manage Your Global Reputation: A Guide to the Dynamics of International Public Relations*. Hampshire, England: Palgrave.

Molleda, J.C. (2000). *Integrative public relations in international business: The impact of administrative models and subsidiary roles*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Molleda, J.C. (2009, March 19). Global Public Relations. Institute for Public Relations Essential Knowledge Project.

Molleda, J.C., & Laskin, A.V. (2005). *Global, international, comparative, and regional public relations knowledge from 1990 to 2005: A quantitative content analysis of academic and trade publications.* Miami: Institute for Public Relations.

Molleda, J.C., & Laskin, A.V. (2010). Coordination and control of global public relations to manage cross-national conflict shifts: A multidisciplinary theoretical perspective for research and practice. In G.J. Golan, T.J. Johnson, & W. Wanta (Eds.), *International media communication in a global age* (pp. 319-344). New York: Routledge.

money.cnn.com (2009). *Global 500: Our annual ranking of the world's largest corporations*.

Nally, M. (1991). *International public relations in Practice.* London: Kogan Page.

Newsom, D., VanSlyke Turk, J., & Kruckeberg, D. (2007). *This is PR: The realities of public relations* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Ovaitt, F. (2010, April). If it's social, it connects. *Frontline Online*, April 2010 edition. http://www.ipra.org/frontlinedetail.asp?articleid=1463

Sirkin, H.L., Hemerling, J.W., & Bhattacharya, A.K. (2008). *Globality: Competing with everyone from everywhere for everything.* London: Headline Publishing Group.

Sriramesh, K. (2003). Introduction. In Sriramesh, K., & Verčič, D. (Eds.), *The global public relations handbook.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Traverse-Healy, T. (1991). "The corporate aspect," in M. Nally (ed.), *International public relations in practice* (pp. 31-39). London: Kogan Page.

Tunstall, J. (2008). *The media were American: U.S. mass media in decline.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Van Camp, S. (2010, March). Nestle's Facebook conundrum. In *The PR Newsblog*.

Verčič, D. (2003). Public relations of movers and shakers: Transnational corporations. In K.Sriramesh & D. Verčič (Eds.), *The global public relations handbook* (pp. 478-489). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vercic, D., Grunig, L., & Grunig, J. (1996). "Global and specific principles of public relations: Evidence from Slovenia." In H. Culbertson and N. Chen (eds.), *International public relations: A comparative analysis* (pp. 31-65). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wakefield, R. (1997*). International public relations: A theoretical approach to excellence based on a worldwide Delphi study.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Maryland-College Park.

Wakefield, R. (2000). "World-class public relations: A model for effective public relations in the multinational," *Journal of Communication Management,* 5(1), pp. 59-71.

Wakefield, R. (2001). "Public Relations in the Multinational Organization." In R.L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 639-648). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wakefield, R. (2008). Theory of International Public Relations, the Internet, and Activism: A Personal Reflection. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 20*(1), 138-157.

Wakefield, R. (2009). Public relations contingencies in a globalized world where even "globalization" is not sufficient*. Public Relations Journal* (online edition), Vol. 3, No. 4, Fall 2009. http://www.prsa.org/SearchResults/download/6D-030401/0/Public_Relations_Contingencies_in_a_Globalized_Wor

Wilcox, D.L., Ault, P., & Agee, W.K. (1989). *Public relations strategies and tactics,* 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row.

Wright, D., & Hinson, M. (2010). *A longitudinal analysis of changes in new communications media use by public relations practitioners: A two-year trend study.* Presented at the 93rd annual conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Denver, CO, Aug. 4-7, 2010.

TABLE 1: *Frontline Online* Authors Cited in the Chapter

Bach, A.D. (Apr 2009). *[PR Puts University Research on the Map](#)*.

Badaro, R. (Apr 2009). *[The Boat on the Nile](#)*.

Bleeker, A. (Feb 2009). *[Pipes that Carry Messages](#)*.

Cambie, S., & Ooi, Y.M. (Aug 2009). *[Rethinking Public Relations](#)*.

Cheung, M.L. (Feb 2009). *[Avoiding Embarrassment in Asia](#)*.

Cosby, R. (Jun 2009). *[The Elasticity of English](#)*.

Edelman, R. (Apr 2009). *[Rebuilding the License to Operate](#)*.

Ehrhart, C. (Jun 2009). *[The Kaleidoscope of Asia](#)*.

Faku, N. (Jun 2009). *[Africa's Plurality Presents Public Affairs Challenges](#)*.

Gergova, M. (Aug 2009). *[President's Perspective: Global Reach, Regional Leadership](#)*.

Grupp, R. (Apr 2010). *[Thanks for the Most Amazing Year!](#)*

Hardie, F. (Feb 2009). *[Sorting Out the Best From the Rest](#)*

Hepworth, V. (Oct 2009). *[Trends in Public Affairs](#)*.

Hunt, K. (Feb 2010). *[Rethinking Business for the New Decade](#)*.

Kobeh, V. (Jun 2009). *[LatAm's New Media Reality](#)*.

Molleda, J.C. (Apr 2009). *[Authentic Passion About Colombia](#)*.

Pankratieva, Z. (Apr 2009). *[A Contrasting Perspective on Ukraine](#)*.

Seaman, P. (Apr 2010): *[CSR: Not the Same in Lagos as London](#)*.

Shimmin, R. (Feb 2010). *[Building and Protecting Brands Across Borders](#)*

Soutus, S.H. (Apr 2010): *[Serving Coke to Dr Frankenstein](#)*.

Thornton, G. (Feb 2010). *[Relationship-Building for Global Stakeholder Engagement](#)*.

Tunheim, K. (Apr 2010): *Connective Tissue for a 'Glocal' World*.

Wahlen, D. (Jun 2009). *Opportunities and Threats in Belgium*.

Wells, G. (Apr 2010). *The United States is a Foreign Country, too*.