Mhjournal
MIGUEL HERNÁNDEZ COMMUNICATION JOURNAL
ISSN: 1989-8681

Vertical study of online reputation tools to measure public relations and communication activity

Mariana Sueldo | mariana.sueldo@kf.vu.lt
Vilnius University – Faculty of Communication

Marc Compte-Pujol | mcomptepuj@uoc.edu
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya – Estudios de Ciencias de la Información y de la Comunicación

Joan Cuenca-Fontbona | joancf@blanquerna.url.edu
Universitat Ramon Llull – Facultad de Comunicación y Relaciones Internacionales Blanquerna

Summary

Abstract

Introduction: Since the 1960s the interest in measuring the function of public relations and corporate communication has noticeably increased, thus the emergence of proposals for measurement indicators simply followed suit. Some models that explored this activity have focused on analyzing the relationships established between an organization and its publics, while others have explored the concept of corporate reputation. Currently, this function is also monitored in social networks.

Method and Analysis: The present study has delved into the structure of online reputation metrics listed by famous market research company Forrester that regularly publishes the state of the art for these types of tools (Liu, 2020; 2021). Delving further into previous descriptive research (Cuenca Fontbona, Matilla & Compte-Pujol, 2016), a descriptive study has been carried out of the websites of the organisations offering these metrics or "social listening platforms". Additional primary data has been collected through qualitative semi-structured interviews with communication professionals (N=180) from Lithuania in organizations of various sectors, in order to explore the level of awareness, adoption and usefulness of these online measurement tools for strategic decision making.

Results: It can be firmly claimed that all these digital monitors stem from a tradition set on the construct of reputation, while relationships, the very essence of the public relations profession, are excluded. Besides, there is an enormous confusion of terminology and criteria about the variables used; the lack of a universally valid instrument is evident. The value proposition includes some type of exercise related to public relations and corporate communication, yet the "online" corporate reputation metrics fail to encompass the extensive multidisciplinary area of action that these disciplines display.

Conclusion: Although the management of intangible resources is a benchmark, these tools only provide quantitative information about the reputational image of a single stakeholder: consumers/customers, focusing on drivers related to the marketing and commercialization of the company's products. Thus, they fail to provide comprehensive information on the reality of an organization's corporate reputation.

Estudio vertical de las herramientas de reputación online para medir la actividad de las relaciones públicas y la comunicación

Mariana Sueldo | mariana.sueldo@kf.vu.lt
Vilnius University – Faculty of Communication

Marc Compte-Pujol | mcomptepuj@uoc.edu
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya – Estudios de Ciencias de la Información y de la Comunicación

Joan Cuenca-Fontbona | joancf@blanquerna.url.edu
Universitat Ramon Llull – Facultad de Comunicación y Relaciones Internacionales Blanquerna

---

Palabras clave

"Comunicación corporativa; "medición"; "monitores digitales"; "relaciones públicas".

Sumario

Resumen

Introducción: Desde la década de 1960, el interés por medir la función de las relaciones públicas y la comunicación corporativa ha aumentado notablemente, comportando la aparición de propuestas de indicadores de medición. Algunos modelos que han explorado esta actividad se han centrado en analizar las relaciones que se establecen entre una organización y sus públicos, mientras que otros han explorado el concepto de reputación corporativa. Actualmente, esta función también se monitorea en las redes sociales.

Método y análisis: El presente estudio ha profundizado en la estructura de las métricas de reputación online enumeradas por la famosa empresa de investigación de mercado Forrester, que publica periódicamente el estado del arte de este tipo de herramientas (Liu, 2020; 2021). Profundizando en investigaciones descriptivas previas (Cuenca-Fontbona, Matilla & Compte-Pujol, 2016), se ha realizado un estudio descriptivo de las webs de las organizaciones que ofrecen estas métricas o "plataformas de escucha social". Se recopilaron datos primarios adicionales a través de entrevistas cualitativas semiestructuradas con profesionales de la comunicación (N=180) de Lituania en organizaciones de varios sectores, con el fin de explorar el nivel de conocimiento, adopción y utilidad de estas herramientas de medición en línea para la toma de decisiones estratégicas.

Resultados: Se puede afirmar que todos los monitores digitales analizados parten de una tradición asentada en el constructo de la reputación, quedando excluidas las relaciones, esencia misma de la profesión de relaciones públicas. Además, existe una enorme confusión de terminología y criterios sobre las variables utilizadas; la falta de un instrumento universalmente válido es evidente. La propuesta de valor incluye algún tipo de ejercicio relacionado con las relaciones públicas y la comunicación corporativa, pero las métricas de reputación corporativa "online" no logran abarcar el amplio campo de actuación multidisciplinar que despliegan estas disciplinas.

Conclusión: Si bien la gestión de los recursos intangibles es un referente, estas herramientas solo brindan información cuantitativa sobre la imagen reputacional de un único grupo de interés: los consumidores/clientes, centrándose en los impulsores relacionados con el marketing y la comercialización de los productos de la empresa. Por lo tanto, no brindan información completa sobre la realidad de la reputación corporativa de una organización.

1. Introduction

The consolidation of the Internet as a tool for communication and information exchange has modified the structures and working models of public relations (PR). The social machinery of the opinion of the different key audiences has acquired consistency in this new digital scenario and, for this reason, the current approaches of this discipline consider it essential to intervene strategically in this environment.

The 2.0 scenario facilitates interaction with many actors, but the integration of these digital resources is possible if the entity is prepared to adopt a 2.0 culture. Acceptance of this type of culture means designing communication actions to promote dialogue with these audiences, listening to the opinions of its members and valuing the criticisms that circulate on social networks as a means for learning. Investing in this type of attitude and online communication guarantees a quality relationship between an organisation and its publics and an advantageous reputation. But these two PR variables and main exponents of the intangible resources of greatest strategic organisational value, relationship and reputation, contain clear deficits of understanding, management and measurement. These gaps are even more accentuated in the digital environment.

This paper examines the main metrics that are defined to assess the performance of PR in social networks. The purpose is to gain an understanding of the reference framework they come from, the object of study they evaluate, the indicators that determine the algorithms, their reliability and validity, with the aim of discovering what their benefit is.

2. Theoretical framework

In the 1970s, the value of an organisation was based on its tangible assets. Today, 80% of the total value of an entity resides in its intangible resources (Corporate Excellence, 2014). Thus, they now face the challenge of establishing rigorous indicators and measurement models to demonstrate the contribution of these resources to the generation of business value.

Without an agreed definition of the concept of "relationship" (Broom and Casey, 2000) and the concept of "reputation" (Wartick, 2002), it is difficult for academics and practitioners to manage and assess these same constructs as independent objects of study. But they are also two variables that, in recent years, have stimulated profound debates about the contribution of the PR function to the organisation and its incorporation into the accounting system. The study of this issue began with the Barcelona Declaration of Principles of 2010, updated in 2015, which

agreed for the first time on what was meant by "measurement and evaluation", and has made notable progress thanks to the efforts of institutions such as AMEC-International Association for the Measurement and Evaluation, Global Alliance for Public Relations and Communication Management, ICCO, PRSA-Public Relations Society of America, Asociación de Directivos de Comunicación, Dircom and Corporate Excellence-Centre for Reputation Leadership. It is also one of the recurring themes of the transnational study "European Communication Monitor" by Zerfass et al., 2015 and the basis of the local study MERCO-Monitor Empresarial de Reputación Corporativa. The academic sphere also has extensive spaces for debate in EUPRERA-European Public Relations Education and Research Association. The Institute for Public Relations specifically has the IPR Measurement Commission, dedicated to developing and promoting standards and best practices for research, measurement and analysis. And, of course, it is worth recalling the historical journey of authors who have explored the tribute of PR and communication to the organisation. This path was started by Matrat (1971), and followed by Broom (1977), Ferguson (1984), Fombrun (1996), Villafañe (2004), Lindenmann (2006), Van Riel (2012), Grunig and Hon (1999), Grunig and Huang (2000), Matilla (2018), Stacks (2006), Downs and Adrian (2012), Delahaye Paine (2011), Arboleda Naranjo (2004), Xifra (2011), Seltzer (2006), Álvarez-Nobell and Lesta (2011), Marca (2018), Ponzi, Fombrun and Gardberg (2011), Cuenca-Fontbona (2018), Alloza, Carreras and Carreras (2012), and Argenti (2014), among others.

Wilcox Cameron and Xifra (2012, p. 124) explain the dimensions of most interest for oganisations are of a mercantile nature. The measurement in economic terms of the results obtained with this discipline is the most sought-after review by practitioners, agencies and consultancies. These measurement models have their frame of reference in one of the two lines of thought on PR which, since the 1990s, have been the basis of the theoretical "corpus" of this discipline: the line promoted by Van Riel and Fombrun (2007) regarding concepts of reputation and corporate communication (CC), which shields the accounting profitability of the results of investments in communication (Matilla, 2018). This academic trend has led to a migration from a philosophy that valued the management of perceptions to a "praxis" based on financial evidence of the effectiveness of PR and communication programmes. From a paradigmatic approach focused on the quality of relations with the entire map of audiences and communication management, to a doctrine based on return on investment, ROI which, in PR, is a business term still in arbitrary use and pending sectoral consensus, but which is a vitally important element because it has the virtue of making any operation of the organisation tangible for Watson and Zerfass (2011).

Corporate reputation is a dependent variable [in an antecedent-consequent sequence, interpretable as cause-effect, the event that occurs second corresponds to the dependent variable, cfr. Riba (2009)] of an effective and committed relationship of an organisation with its publics (Cuenca-Fontbona et al., 2016) and

is one of the most important non-financial resources of organisations (Alloza et al., 2012, p. 23). And the dimensions that make up the study of reputation, theorised by Fombrun, are: (a) corporate citizenship and responsibility, (b) work and job quality, (c) business leadership, (d) ethics and good governance, (e) economic performance, (f) products and services, and (g) the perception of constant innovation (Fombrun, 1996). Corporate reputation correlates with financial performance and, in this sense, measures of Fortune magazine rankings, or similar, have been taken as a reference. It also connects with the mechanisms that generate behaviours of value for a company, requiring, in this second case, theoretically based indices with proven psychometric properties such as the "Reputation Quotient" (RQ), the "Global Rep Track Pulse", or the "Highhouse", among others (Alloza et al., 2012).

Now the growing interest in assessing corporate reputation has shifted to the online sphere. If reputation is a perception of the degree of admiration, positive feelings and trust that an individual has for another person, an organisation, an industry or even a country (Van Riel, 2012, p. 164), online reputation is the result of what customers, employees and other groups say, write and transmit anywhere on the Internet social media based on their perceptions and experience at any time of their direct or indirect relationship with that brand (del Fresno, 2012, p. 14). The expressions disseminated on social networks, their presence, orientation, and the authority and quality of the speaker are of increasing concern to those responsible for managing communication. The "1st INTED report" (2014) shows, for example, that the emotion, experience and attitude generated in digital ecosystems have a direct impact on the business variable, the stock market price. And, according to studies conducted by KPMG (https://home.kpmg.com/es/es/home.html), approximately 30% of the world's 100 largest investors have formalised policies that demand non-financial value from companies as a premise for keeping them in their investment portfolios. Meanwhile, the "Nielsen Studies" (http://www.nielsen.com/es/es.html) shows that 53% of users prefer to use social networks to make queries or complaints to a company, and that 65% learn about a brand through these social networks. The comments made on the network have a decisive impact on the assessment of brands. It is for this reason that various methodologies, approaches and proposals have emerged for analysis, monitoring and measurement of all kinds, both local and international, based essentially on computer mechanisms, semantic filters and complex algorithms.

3. Methodology

Faced with this new scenario, we set out to answer a single research question (RQ1) by analysing online platforms that assess this dependent variable of excellent relationships: reputation. This exercise has been carried out to certify or controvert the validity and reliability of these instruments as solid models for

measuring corporate reputation.

RQ1: Is the value proposition offered by online corporate reputation metrics useful for obtaining comprehensive information about the reality of an organisation's reputation?

H1. The value proposition focuses on the drivers related to the marketing and commercialisation of the company's products.

H2. They provide information about the reputational image of a single stakeholder group: consumers.

H3. The benefit promised by these platforms is not identified with all the dimensions that define reputation.

H4. There is no global online, multi-stakeholder, cross-cultural corporate reputation metric that applies a global quantitative and qualitative research methodology.

H5. Online corporate reputation metrics only provide commercial outcomes and do not address the other dimensions that define corporate reputation.

In the four levels of DPRG/ECV evaluation, an "outcome" is the assessment of the behaviours that people adopt after being impacted by the "outputs" which, in turn, are the media where audiences can see the messages that an organisation issues (DPRG/ICV, 2009).

In order to answer the question and to verify or refute the hypotheses, the literature specialising in PR and CC was consulted in order to understand the meaning of the reputation variable in the virtual sphere. Specialised scientific publications have been consulted in order to locate the large universe of metrics of this nature. Even though, there are some free social listening tools (the 5 top ones being Mention.com, TweetDeck, Google Alerts, Twilert, Twitter Advanced Search amongst others), given the large volume of paid monitoring initiatives, a sample of the ten (10) top paid online reputation metrics was selected in accordance with the list exhibited in the publication about these tools "The Forrester Wave: Enterprises Listening Platforms", 2021, by the US company Forrester (Liu, 2020; 2021). These paid platforms are: Brandwatch, NetBase Quid, Synthesio, Sprinklr, LinkInfluence, TalkWalker, Digimind, MeltWater, Zignalab and ListenFirst. Forrester Research is an independent US market research company that periodically publishes the state of the art on these types of tools.

A descriptive study was then carried out of the websites of the organisations offering these metrics or "social listening platforms", a concept popularised by Forrester Research itself. The instruments have been ranked according to the data available in the American company (Liu, 2020; 2021). Since early 2009, Forrester Research has been publishing reports based on 64-criteria evaluation model on the market for conversation measurement and monitoring tools. Yet, the criteria are not explained in detail, so there is no exhaustive explanation to establish when a tool has been ranked ahead of others in its studies (Covelo, 2012).

All selected digital platforms offer an initial free trial. Therefore, all the above-mentioned demos were downloaded in order to experiment with their solutions. In addition, six (6) experts in this type of tools from PR and communication agencies and from the online companies explored were consulted via online messaging. After identifying and testing each of these instruments, an "ad hoc" analysis template was designed containing various entries to locate the analysis variables: name, value proposition, technological analysis tool, applied techniques; the used sources and the framework of results or outcomes obtained (see summary in Table A1, A2, A3, provided in the Appendix A).

In order to further explore the awareness level and potential use of these platforms, qualitative semi-structured interviews were held (in person or via online (Zoom, MS Teams, Skype) with communication professionals (N=180) working in different organizations of various sectors in Lithuania. They were asked whether they had ever heard about the top 10 social listening, and if so, whether they used or intended to use them or not and why. The analysis has been quantitative and qualitative, with textual units corresponding to coded and categorised registers, synthesised and interpreted applying the theoretical frame of reference here provided. Conclusions have been drawn up to answer the main question and contrast the hypotheses of this work. The analysis of online reputation metrics was carried out consecutively in duplicate through the non-participant intervention of three independent researchers.

The research was conducted between 01.02.2022 and 05.06.2022.

4. Results

The value propositions (benefit for users) of the different instruments are: increase revenues, reducing costs and saving time, driving business results, managing risk and crises, managing brand health, tracking sentiment in real time, facilitate business decision making or answering strategic business questions, enable optimisation of ROI of social media marketing and activities, monitoring and measuring corporate reputation online, analysing competition, benchmarking, identifying

influencers and their reach, gaining media coverage, facilitate online strategic planning, measuring campaign performance, managing social customer experience and sentiment.

Even though 7 of the examined tools mention (brand) reputation management/monitoring amongst their key offers, findings show that 100% of the online reputation platforms provide information about the reputational image of a single individual group: consumers. And 100% of the offers are commercial, marketing and/or financial. In only 30% of the cases, there are some propositions related to the exercise of PR and CC. Risk and crisis management appears in 40% of the sample; brand management and protection in 90%; and interaction, engagement and customer/consumer service in 75% of the same sample. Meanwhile, only three platforms mention PR and communication (media relations, PR reporting and analysis of communication plans) in their value propositions: LinkInfluence, Meltwater and Zignalb, the last 3 of these top 10 tools. Around 80% of the sample offers different types of social research: real-time sentiment tracking, identifying influencers and their reach, market and competitor research.

Most of the platforms position themselves as 'best for' digital marketing managers, market researchers, brand analysts/managers, social media managers; meanwhile only 2 of them are categorized as also *suitable or useful* for PR and communication professionals: Meltwater and Talkwalker, yet the last one does not even mention PR and communication in its own website.

- It is noted that each measurement tool offers different analysis techniques:

- Natural language analysis (NLP) or conversation and buzz analysis.

- Text or sentence analysis and contextualisation, keywords tracking

- Analysis of digital stories and narrative's trajectory

- Sentiment, mood and emotion analysis.

- Geo-localisation and automatic translation

- Surveys, focus groups, social media, CRM data, chat logs, support forum

- Brand image tracking

- Data Clustering

- Interactive graphs

- Multi-filter analysis

- AI-driven topic identification

Metrics draw data from these social sources (classification according to Merodio, 2010): management and forums: Websites, Forums, Bazaarvoice, Tianya.

Other sources include publications (Blogspot, WordPress), mobile applications, online media articles, collaborative spaces (Wikis).

It can also be observed that all the metrics in the virtual environment bear fruit in a series of outcomes related to the commercial area of the company:

- Most visited products, most searched features and time spent.

- Opinions on what is most valued and what causes frustration about the product.

- Insights into consumer purchase intentions, preferences, wants and needs.

- Market presence and market trends.

Some outcomes are related to simplified data visualization and democratization with actionable insights, yet again to benchmark the share of consumer voice, facilitate or boost sales.

Two types of outcomes related to corporate reputation are also mentioned: brand health and performance of key brand attributes. Other outcomes are ambiguous: stance, opinion and emotion expressed by a person on a topic in an online mention; customer insights on topics, experience with the brand, consumer tastes and themes about the brand and competitors.

Finally, only three platforms (LinkInfluence, Meltwater, Zignalab) include PR and communication related outcomes for other stakeholders, beyond consumers/customers: customized instant insights pages and reports for every stakeholder, also internal ones; PR pulse by negative & positive mentions and their impact on the brand; detection of threating narratives.

Regarding the findings from the qualitative interviews, very few communication professionals have heard about these tools and even fewer have used them or intend to adopt them.

Table 1. Knowledge and use of top 10 social listening tools in Lithuania-based companies

Social listening tool	Know/have heard about	Use/have used
Brandwatch	16	4
NetBase Quid	3	3
Sprinkler	11	7
TalkWalker	2	1
Digimind	2	2
Synthesio	9	6
LinkInfluence	5	1
MeltWater	6	6
Zignalab	2	2
ListenFirst	2	-

Source: own elaboration

Informants who have heard, know and have used these platforms explain that market size in Lithuania is too small for such data mining tools, or some data are less relevant for their job and Twitter is far less popular here and little used here. Out of the 180 informants, 85% were PR/Corporate communication managers or mid-level communication professionals for whom these platforms may not provide what they really need, precisely because these tools are mostly sales-oriented, instead of relationship-focused encompassing all stakeholders, with the exceptions already mentioned (LinkInfluence, Meltwater of Zignalab) and these only partially PR-oriented.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

In general, it has been found that the measurement models are focused on the marketing and commercialisation of the company's products, and on a single audience of interest: the consumer. This would suggest, according to Walsh and Beatty (as quoted in Alloza et al., 2012, pp. 107-108), that these are partial scales of singular "uni-stakeholder" reputation, similar to the better-known traditional scale of customer-based reputation CBR. And, this being the case, all of them can be considered to move away from the holistic concept of reputation theorised by Fombrun (1996). It is also true that their value proposition includes exercise related to PR and CC. Even so, the "online" corporate reputation metrics do not contemplate all the actions that make up the discipline of PR, nor the extensive multidisciplinary area of action that defines CC. On the other hand, the metrics are also positioned as instruments that study the market and the competition and

help to locate "influencers", functions that have no relation whatsoever with the monitoring of online corporate reputation.

In this vertical analysis, it has also been discovered that online corporate reputation metrics have several products that are useful for certain monitoring functions, but that there is no global instrument. It is not yet possible to monitor 100% of the network, according to the online reputation agency Listeninc Online Insights in Paterna, Valencia (http://listenic.com/). Thus, there is no global online corporate reputation metric either, due to another reason: the many technological limitations that still exist.

It is observed that no metric in the analysis sample offers a total methodology that compiles the different methodologies of social research, quantitative or qualitative. The application of crawling engines and web analytics, semantic analysis, graphic design and statistical processing is still heir to the traditional press-clipping system. Thus, the challenges faced by these tools are, on the one hand, semantic, to be able to offer an acceptable quality and validity of the outcomes, and on the other hand, technical, to be able to better identify, track and classify these outcomes, and to integrate platforms for direct interaction with users.

Another issue that is also identified as relevant is that not all the sources used are repeated in each of the metrics under study. Depending on the instrument, information is collected from certain online sources and not from others. This is another reason for the partial contribution of these teams.

Finally, all the metrics analysed that assess corporate reputation in the virtual environment offer a series of outcomes consistent with the initial commercial value proposition and, to a lesser extent, related to corporate reputation. The outcomes offered by the different online metrics do not address all the dimensions that define corporate reputation.

These findings provide a negative answer to RQ1 ("Is the value proposition offered by online corporate reputation metrics useful for obtaining comprehensive information on the reality of an organisation's corporate reputation?).

Finally, regarding the hypotheses:

H1. The hypothesis is qualified, as the value proposition of an online-reputation metric focuses mainly, but not exclusively, on the drivers related to the marketing and commercialisation of the company's products.

H2. The hypothesis is confirmed, as they are instruments that provide information about the reputational image of a single individual group: consumers.

H3. The hypothesis is confirmed, as the benefit promised by these platforms is not identified with all the dimensions that define reputation.

H4. The hypothesis is confirmed, as there is no global metric of online, multi-stakeholder and cross-cultural corporate reputation that applies a global quantitative and qualitative research methodology.

H5. The hypothesis is qualified, as these instruments only offer outcomes of a commercial nature and the vast majority do not address the other dimensions that define corporate reputation.

Amongst key implications, this study seeks to emphasize the relevance of revisiting the concept of reputation, its evolution and incorporation of new elements, the growing importance of integral and wholesome online reputation management. Furthermore, the digital ecosystem is increasingly blurring boundaries between academic fields and professional practices; digital literacy of stakeholders enables them to become consumers and prosumers of content and information. This in turns poses new demands on practitioners to build relations and monitor interactions with a wider range of technologically savvy stakeholders, not only with consumers. Yet, most of the existing analytic tools seem to be designed for a narrower matrix of stakeholders, thus impoverishing and undermining the concept and scope of reputation as a multifactor and multidimensional reality.

6. Limitations and further lines of research

A clear limitation of the present study is the sample of interviewees. The size is fairly adequate for this preliminary analysis at awareness level; however, comparative analysis with communication professionals from other countries would be insightful.

Another limitation is the fact that the empirical work was focused on a descriptive analysis of the existing social listening tools and the level of awareness about their availability and potential use from the interviewed communication practitioners' point of view. However, in some cases it is not their own decision to acquire or implement the use of such analytical tools; in other cases, this task is entrusted to or carried out by sales and marketing professionals (not communication or public relations managers) whose main audience may be the consumer. For the later, the analysed tools may suit their goals; meanwhile due to the broader spectrum of publics that communication or public relations managers seek to reach, the

explored social listening instruments lack depth and scope to provide data and metrics on a more comprehensive stakeholder matrix.

Further empirical research could involve questions such as how online reputation metrics evolve to encompass other stakeholders and how they are implemented by organizations and agencies providing communication/public relation services.

This line of research will provide a long continuity in the future, as technology advances, and given the interest in the subject on the part of academics and practitioners. Thus, we plan to continue making new contributions to the subject of study, which we intend to identify, compile, analyse and continue to publish in the coming years.

7. References

Alloza, A., Carreras, E. y Carreras, A. (2012). *Reputación Corporativa*. Madrid: LID.

Álvarez-Nobell, A. y Lesta, L. (2011). "Medición de los aportes de la gestión estratégica de comunicación interna a los objetivos de la organización". *Palabra Clave*, 14.

AMEC-International Association for the Measurement and Evaluation (n.d.). Corporate website. [http://amecorg.com].

AMEC; ICCO; Institute for Public Relations; Public Relations Society of America (2010). *Barcelona Declaration of Measurement Principles*. [https://amecorg.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Barcelona-Declaration-of-Measurement-Principles-2010.pdf]

Arboleda Naranjo, R. (2004). *Indicadores de medida aplicados a la gestión de las relaciones públicas*. Madrid: AENOR.

Argenti, P.A. (2014). *Comunicación Estratégica y su contribución a la reputación*. Madrid: LID.

Asociación de Directivos de Comunicación, Dircom (n.d.). Corporate website. [http://www.dircom.org].

Broom, G.M. (1977). "Coorientational measurement of public issues". *Public Relations Review*, 3(4), pp. 110-119.

Broom, G. M. y Casey, S. (2000). "Concept and Theory of Organization – Public Relationships". In: J.A. Ledingham y S.D. Bruning (coord.). *Public Relations as Relationship Management: A Relational Approach to the Study and Practice of Public Relations*. Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Corporate Excellence-Centre for Reputation Leadership (n.d.). Corporate website. [http://blog.corporateexcellence.org].

Corporate Excellence-Centre for Reputation Leadership (2014). *La medición en la economía de los intangibles: métricas específicas y visión holística*. [http://www.corporateexcellence.org/index.php/Compartimos-conocimiento/La-medicion-en-la-economia-de-los-intangibles-metricas-específicas-y-vision-holistica].

Covelo, A. (2012). *Evaluación de herramientas de medición de la reputación online: Introducción.* [http://covelo.com/2012/08/29/evaluacion-de-herramientas-de-medicion-de-la-reputacion-online-introduccion/].

Cuenca-Fontbona, J. (2018). *Cómo hacer un plan estratégico de comunicación. Vol. III: La investigación estratégica preliminar*. Barcelona: UOC.

Cuenca-Fontbona, J., Matilla, K. & Compte-Pujol, M. (2016). "Medición de las relaciones públicas mediante modelos, indicadores y técnicas online en una sociedad conectada: un estudio vertical". En: K. Matilla (ed.), *Casos de estudio de relaciones públicas: Sociedad conectada: empresas y universidades*. Barcelona: UOC, pp. 27-58.

Del Fresno, M. (2012). *El consumidor social: reputación online y social media*. Barcelona: UOC.

Delahaye Paine, K. (2011). *Measure What Matters: Online Tools for Understanding Customers, Social Media, Engagement, and Key Relationships*. Hoboken (NJ): John Wiley and Sons.

DPRG/ICV Deutsche Public Relations Gesellschaft/Internationaler Conroller Verein. (2009). *DPRG/ICV framework for communication measurement*. Berlin: DPRG. [www.communicationcontrolling.com].

Downs, C.W. & Adrian, A.D. (2012). *Assessing Organizational Communication Strategic Communication Audits*. New York: Guilford Press.

EUPRERA-European Public Relations Education and Research Association (n.d.). Corporate website. [http://www.euprera.org].

European Communication Monitor (n.d.). Corporate website. [http://www.communicationmonitor.eu].

Ferguson, M.A. (1984). "Building theory in public relations: Interorganizational relationships as public relations paradigma". *Presentado en la conferencia anual de la Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication*. Gainesville (FL).

Fombrun, C.J. (1996). *Reputation: Realizing Value from the Corporate Image*. New York: Harvard Business School Press.

Forrester Research (n.d.). Corporate website. [https://www.forrester.com/home].

Global Alliance for Public Relations and Communication Management (n.d.). Corporate website. [http://www.globalalliancepr.org].

Grunig, J. E. y Hon, L. (1999). *Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations*. Gainesville (FL): IPR. [http://www.instituteforpr.org/research_single/guidelines_measuring_relationships/].

Grunig J.E. y Huang Y.-H. (2000). "From Organizational Effectiveness to Relationships Indicators: Antecedents of Relationships, Public Relations Strategies, and Relationship Outcomes". In: J.A. Ledingham; S.D. Bruning (coord.). *Public Relations as Relationship Management: A Relational Approach to the Study and Practice of Public Relations*. Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum.

INTED (2014). *I Informe de Activos Intangibles en Ecosistemas Digitales.* [http://www.corporateexcellence.org/index.php/Compartimos-conocimiento/I-Informe-de-Activos-Intangibles-en-Ecosistemas-Digitales-INTED].

Lindenmann, W. (2006). *Public Relations Research for Planning and Evaluation*. Gainesville (FL): IPR. [http://www.instituteforpr.org/files/uploads/2006_Planning_Eval.pdf].

Liu, J. & Dawson, S. (2020). *The Forrester wave™: Social Listening Platforms, Q4 2020*. Forrester Research Inc., November, 10.

Liu, J. (2021). *Get smarter on social media measurement*. Forrester Research Inc., May, 14.

Marca, G. (2018). *Cómo hacer un plan estratégico de comunicación. Vol. IV: La investigación estratégica de evaluación*. Barcelona: UOC.

Matilla, K. (2018). *Cómo hacer un plan estratégico de comunicación. Vol. I: Un modelo de planificación estratégica, paso a paso*. Barcelona: UOC.

Matrat, L. (1971). *Relations publiques et management*. Brussels: CERP.

MERCO-Monitor Empresarial de Reputación Corporativa (n.d.). Corporate website. [http://www.merco.info/es].

Merodio, J. (2010). *Marketing en Redes Sociales: Mensajes de empresa para gente selectiva*. [http://www.bubok.es/libros/191596/Marketing-en-Redes-Sociales-Mensajes-de-empresa-para-gente-selectiva].

Ponzi, L.J., Fombrun, C.J. y Gardberg, N. A. (2011). "RepTrakTM Pulse: Conceptualizing and Validating a Short-Form Measure of Corporate Reputation". *Corporate Reputation Review*, 14(1). [http://www.stakeholderslab.nl/wp-content/uploads/CRR_v14_n1_Ponzi2.pdf].

PRSA-Public Relations Society of America (n.d.). Corporate website [https://www.prsa.org].

Riba, C. (2009). *Introducció als mètodes d'investigació en psicologia*. Barcelona: UOC.

Seltzer, T. (2006). *Measuring the Impacts of Public Relations: A Coorientational Approach to Analyze the Organization-Public Relationship*. Gainesville (FL): IPR [http://www.instituteforpr.org/files/uploads/2005_ Seltzer.pdf].

Stacks, D.W. (2006). *Dictionary or Public Relations Measurement and Research*. Gainesville (FL): IPR. [http://www.instituteforpr.org/files/uploads/PRMR_Dictionary_1.pdf].

The Institute for Public Relations (n.d.). Corporate website. [http://www.instituteforpr.org].

Van Riel, C.B.M. (2012). *Alinear para ganar.* Madrid: LID.

Van Riel, C.B.M. y Fombrun, C.J. (2007). *Essentials of corporate communication: Implementing practices for effective reputation management.* London: Routledge.

Villafañe, J. (2004). *La buena reputación. Claves del valor intangible de las empresas.* Madrid: Pirámide.

Wartick, S. (2002). "Measuring Corporate Reputation: Definition and Data". *Business & Society*, 41(4).

Watson, T. y Zerfass, A. (2011). "Return on investment in public relations: A critique of concepts used by practitioners from communication and management sciences perspectivas". *PRism* 8(1): [http://www.prismjournal.org/ homepage. html].

Wilcox, D. L., Cameron, G. T. y Xifra, J. (2012). *Relaciones Públicas: estrategias y tácticas.* 10ª ed. Madrid: Pearson Educación.

Xifra, J. (2011). *Manual de Relaciones Públicas e Institucionales.* Barcelona: UOC.

Zerfass, A., Verdic, D., Verhoeven, P., Moreno, A. y Tench, R. (2015). *European Communication Monitor 2015. Creating communication value through listening, messaging and measurement. Results of a Survey in 41 Countries.* Brussels: EACD/EUPRERA, Helios Media.

8. Appendix A

Table A1. Online reputation measurement tools (top 10 Social listening tools ranked by Forrester Wave 2021)

Tool	Value proposition	Proprietary tools, apps	Analysis	Sources	Outcomes
1. Brandwatch	Facilitating business decision-making Optimizing ROI marketing in media and social media Managing reputation Competitor analysis Market research influencers identification and reach	Brandwatch Analytics Brandwatch Vizia	Analysis of Brand sentiment and natural language	+ 80 million online sources, private and public: Blogs, news articles, forums, videos, reviews, images, Twitter, Facebook, Google +, Flickr, Youtube	Position, opinion and emotion expressed by a person on a topic in an online mention.
2. NetBase Quid	Optimizing ROI marketing in media and social media Managing reputation Health and perception of the brand Improving satisfaction and reduce resolution time Aggregating data to eliminate information silos and organizational misalignment Competitor analysis to inform strategy Market research to boost sales by discovering unmet needs of customers	NetBase Quid Social NetBase Live Pulse NLP Advantage NetBase integrates with Google Reviews, Yelp, Bazaarvoice, CNET, TripAdvisor, Amazon, metacritic, Glassdoor, and more of your go-to review and forum sites.	Analysis of Brand sentiment and conversation volume at scale in real- time and over time Surveys, focus groups, social media, CRM data, chat logs, support forum	Global coverage from 200+ countries Integrated Google Reviews, Yelp, Bazaarvoice, CNET, TripAdvisor, Amazon, metacritic, Glassdoor, and forum sites Twitter, Reddit, forums, review sites, Facebook, Instagram, and many more	Insights on sentiment-driven behaviors, emotions about the brand Benchmark of competitive share of voice, Insights on Consumer reaction to attributes such as price, service, and/or delivery Customer profiles for additional target audiences and prospects
3. Sprinklr	Reducing costs Boosting comercial results Risk management Competitor analysis Managing social experience of customers	The Experience Cloud	Analysis of sentiment and emotions	Twitter, Pinterest, Tumblr, Facebook, Linkedin, Google +Bazaarvoice, Snapchat, WordPress, Blogspot, YouTube, Vimeo, Instagram, Weibo	Experiences and insights on the customers with the Brand and its competitors Actionable insights on customer voice in real-time. Market trends
4. Talkwalker	Brand management Campaign strategy Competitive intelligence Content marketing Customer experience Market research Trend analysis Quick benchmarking, measurement and comparison of KPIs	Blue Silk™ technology Omnichannel Data Hub. Conversation Clusters Talkwalker Activate (global consultancy) AI machine learning and NLP technology. Social Content Ratings ® datasets. ReviewBox	AI-powered sentiment analysis and custom categories: billions of consumer/ customer data points across 187 languages. Automatic segmentations: buying lifecycle, issue categories, products, etc. Quantitative competitive analysis benchmarking	Online consumer conversations across social, blogs, forums, and news sites Real time and instant access to up to 5 years of historic data + 40,000 brand logos, objects, and scenes in social images and videos. +60M new videos each day for critical brand mentions.	Simple user interface for actionable intelligence. 40% time saving: automatic report creation, distribution. Easy data visualization and use for non-experts Integrated external & internal customer data sources. Customized dashboards Integrated Social Intelligence directly into social media management for better workflows and data democratization

Table A2. Online reputation measurement tools (top 10 Social listening tools ranked by Forrester Wave 2021)

Tool	Value proposition	Proprietary tools, apps	Analysis	Sources	Outcomes
5. Digimind	Brand reputation, influencers identification campaign analysis customer insights competitive intelligence trend tracking and innovation Influencer identification	Smart social media monitoring apps Digiming Social Analytics Top reputation model integrated with Zoho, Qualtrics, Salesforce and Pardot	Real-time Conversation analysis Online reputation (brand image tracking) Interactive graphs Multi-filter analysis Benchmarking Automatic translation Geolocalization Data Clustering sorted by Date / relevance Automatic sentiment Top influencers Influencer comparison by media type	Twitter, Facebook, Linkedin, YouTube, Instagram, Google Webpages, websites, databases, RRS feeds, forums, etc. Custom sources	Pre-designed templates for easy extraction of reports Daily/weekly/monthly reports Presentation-ready reports Automatic report generation Custom templates Personalized dashboard Multiple formats: pdf, ppt, xls, jpg Instant export ROI Reach measurement And Social statistics
6. Synthesio	Increase ROI in social media activities Reduce costs Measure social impact Manage brand Measure online reputation Market research Risk management CRM Optimize campaigns	Social Reputation Score™ (SRS) SynthesioRank Automatic sentiment analysis (ASA)	Conversation analysis Sentiment analysis	Sina Weibo, Vkontakte, Tianya, etc.	Market trends Sentiment on Brand, products, services and competitors Brand health Market presence and share *Insights* on consumers tastes, preferences, trending topics related to the Brand and its competitors
7. Linkinfluence (since 2021 a Meltwater Group company by acquisition)	Reputation Monitoring Competitive Benchmarking Campaign Performance Measurement across all activities and channels. Brand Equity Tracking Tribes Identification & Activation Customer Experience Analysis Trends Forecasting Monitoring advocacy, PR and Communications Crisis and risk management Content creation and customizing for diverse stakeholders Data structuring, training, project management and consulting	Radarly Social media scheduling tool	Multilingual text analysis capabilities (60+ languages Analysis of spontaneous Conversations Field Expert analysis Sentiment analysis Real-time analysis and AI-driven topic identification	*global data coverage* Deep data coverage and multilingual capability	Instant insight into consumer perceptions and behaviors Reports for every stakeholder, customized instant insights pages for internal customers Customized instant insights reports for every stakeholder, Pages for internal customers Brand health Market trends PR pulse: negative and positive mentions Market presence and share Structured data reports

Table A3. Online reputation measurement tools (top 10 Social listening tools ranked by Forrester Wave 2021)					
Tool	Value proposition	Proprietary tools, apps	Analysis	Sources	Outcomes
8. Meltwater	Brand Management Competitive Analysis Market Research Media Relations Social Marketing Social Media Management PR reporting	all-in-one media intelligence platform. Social media analytics tools	Comprehensive media monitoring and analysis across online news, social media, print, broadcast, and podcasts keywords tracking Media outreach analysis	Automated social media publishing across: Instagram Facebook Twitter LinkedIn	Consumer attitudes and behaviors Spike detection and real-time alerting PR reports on PESO impact Press release distribution Media outreach analysis Customized Digital newsletters Ready-to-use newsfeeds for intranet, internal communications, Slack, corporate messaging applications.
9. Zignalab	Narrative Intelligence fort business solutions and communications Teams Risk and issues compliance management Media monitoring Measure and uplevel impact of communications plan to improve brand reputation and business performance. Identify emerging narratives	Narrative Intelligence Cloud Media Quality Score (MQS).	Continuous scanning and analysis of digital stories narrative's trajectory modern measurement framework for communications	Billions of digital stories All media – from Twitter to Reddit to traditional outlets	Real-time mentions report Score of positive or negative impact of mentions related to the brand Market trends Detection of threating narratives Warning system Metrics on business impact, engagement, resonance and veracity
10. Listenfirst	Maximize social media ROI Manage and measure reputation Centralized Social Media Analytics & Reporting 360 Social Media Strategy Planning Competitive & Industry Benchmarks Campaign & Content Performance Brand Health & Consumer Sentiment	G2 Social Media Analytics Software Influencer & Partner Analytics™ Brand Reputation Index	**Comprehensive Analytics** Sentiment analysis real-time conversation analysis.	Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn, Tiktok, YouTube, Reddit, Tumblr, Pinterest, Comscore	Insights on Brand Health & Consumer Sentiment about products, campaigns, and brand Real-time trends Competitor analysis report Scores for Social Engagement, Social Talkability and Interest

How to cite this text: