

**Enrique Cobos Urbina**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6556-0127>

ecobos@unav.es

Universidad de Navarra

## Social Media: useful for high-risk industries? A study of nuclear energy in Spain

**Submitted**

January 30th, 2019

**Approved**

August 13th, 2020

© 2021

Communication & Society

ISSN 0214-0039

E ISSN 2386-7876

doi: 10.15581/003.34.1.143-154

[www.communication-society.com](http://www.communication-society.com)

2021 – Vol. 34(1)

pp. 143-154

**How to cite this article:**

Cobos Urbina, E. (2021). Social Media: useful for high-risk industries? A study of nuclear energy in Spain. *Communication & Society*, 34(1), 143-154.

**Abstract**

**Social Media has become an unquestionable communicative tool for most organizations. Companies want to participate in the conversation on the network for various purposes: attracting new customers, promoting their products, exalting their brand, searching for prescribers, etc. However, those corporations that belong to risk sectors –as is the case of nuclear power plants– show initial suspicion because they consider that new forms of communication contribute to encouraging criticism of their business model, producing a deterioration in their image. The methodology used in this research is based on three pillars: a review of the literature on CSR, corporate reputation, Social Media and Nuclear Communication; exploration of Social Media in search of official profiles of nuclear power plants; and interviews with those responsible for communicating atomic plants to know their perception in the use of these supports. Spanish nuclear power plants do not actively use Social Media. These facilities rely on monologic communication tools and tactics, although they need dialogue for acceptance and long-term operation. Social Media are essential tools for risk sectors: to**

**disseminate the science they make, to collect feedback and respond to criticism, and to seek consensus.**

**Keywords**

**Nuclear power plants, nuclear energy, crisis communication, nuclear communication, dialogue, Social Media, high-risk business.**

### 1. Introduction

High-risk industries usually have a negative public perception because the goods they produce and the technology they employ can affect people's health or pollute the environment. Society takes a stand against these industries as they perceive that the risk associated with their production is greater than the benefits their commercial activity brings.

Organizations whose crises might result in important social and humanitarian consequences must develop their activity according to the social system. Seeking the common good in their ordinary activity and coherence with social values –as stated by Suchman, Dowling and Pfeffer, Aldrich and Fiol, among others– is a necessary but not sufficient starting point. These good practices must be aligned with excellent communication efforts to transmit corporate identity.

Solid and strategic communication policy is therefore fundamental in order to achieve informative reach and thus gain integration in the environment where they operate. For doing so, the most critical audience, other interest groups capable of influencing public opinion and

the general public must be identified. Then, the companies must use the necessary communication tools to reach this audience and thus integrate themselves in the environment they operate.

The case of the nuclear sector reflects very well the importance of an effective communication policy. This industry usually causes heated debate among public opinion. Thus, it seems appropriate that Nuclear Communication must include a genuine and constant dialogue with the groups of interest to lower the tension of this debate (Foratom, 2016). This two-way communication channel between the nuclear power plant and its stakeholders can enrich their relationship and pave the way for approaching social support, both in normal situations and in times of crisis (IAEA, 2012).

Such high-risk industries need to honestly inform the public about their actual activities. It seems necessary to use information technologies if they want to reach a greater audience. For example, the nuclear power plants of Spain generally use their web pages unidirectionally to communicate with the audience. However, they lack an active presence in Social Media.

Are Social Media a useful tool for high-risk industries? In this article, we assess the communication in nuclear power plants in Spain. We focus on the role that Social Media play in communication with the general public and on the relevance of using them to achieve social legitimacy in high-risk industries.

## **2. Theoretical framework**

### **2.1. *The tension between company and society for the sake of legitimacy***

Tension exists in the relationship between the company and society. On the one hand, society pressures the organization to make better decisions and show an ethical, responsible, committed, and transparent response towards the environment. For this reason, the social agents demand information from the company in those areas that are of general concern such as economic, legal, environmental and/or security in the issues of greatest conflict and social impact. Having such information allows them to evaluate the company coherently and support or not its activity.

On the other hand, the company hopes to maintain a long-standing activity while it is perceived as a socially responsible entity. To achieve these goals, corporations issue information to their target public over the importance and impact of their activity on the environment. Organizations convey these corporate messages in a unidirectional way and with an instrumental character, by and for the survival of the company (Elving *et al.*, 2015).

Two forces arise from this resistance: on the one hand, the company communicates its corporate social responsibility (CSR) actions to the general public and its most important stakeholders. On the other hand, society also dialogues with its stakeholders and publicly assesses the company.

All citizens and institutions have the need and capacity to communicate with their stakeholders. Organizations are not only information providers but also have become recipients, triggering a process of democratization (Castelló, Morsing & Schultz, 2013).

The survival of the company partly depends on public opinion: Society evaluates the usefulness of a company and vets its activity. Valletin (2009, p. 62) states that “[Public opinion] possesses a force of its own –one that is not dependent on the promise or threat of government intervention to have an effect on corporations.”

The external pressure put on by public opinion, especially anticorporate activists’ groups, has forced many organizations to communicate proactively their CSR. By doing so, the company informs about the actions that are made for the common good and shows transparency in the process. For example, Sun Young Lee (2016, p. 444) states that “CSR communications are an essential bridge between a company’s CSR activities and the public’s CSR perception of the company.”

## 2.2. Online reputation in corporate strategy

Organizations seek a favorable reputation to obtain a competitive advantage, internally strengthen corporate culture (Weigelt & Camerer, 1988), and maintain social support through relationships with their target audience. This support can lead to a long-term operation (Pruzan, 2001), keeping in mind that the reality may change and success is not guaranteed (Greyser, 1999).

According to the literature, the benefits of a good reputation can be tangible or intangible (Kantanen, 2012): favorable opinion climate (Shim & Yang, 2016), alliances with other organizations (Caruana, 1997), prestige in times of crisis (Greyser, 1999), financial value (Fombrun & Rindova, 2000), good reputation (Villafañe, 2004), attracting and retaining talent and investors (Walker, 2010), avoiding excessive regulation (Grunig & Hung, 2002), reducing risks (Verčič *et al.*, 2016), increasing product acceptance (Balmer & Worcester, 2009), influencing others (Leiva, 2012) and differentiating from competitors (O'Connor, 2005), among others.

To build a positive reputation, it seems necessary to open up three lines of action: internal institutionalization of CSR; excellent business practices aligned to the common good; and external communication of those values to strengthen ties with key stakeholders (Balmer & Gray, 1998). We believe that this is the most ethical way to build a business reputation, by having a good attitude and communicating properly (Cobos, 2017; Heath, 2011).

Authors such as Broon (2007), O'Connor (2005), Balmer and Gray (1998), and Grunig (1993) emphasized the importance of communication as a link between the identity and reputation of a company: "Organisations that communicate effectively with publics develop better relationships because management and publics understand one another and because both are less likely to behave in ways that have negative consequences on the interests of the other" (Broon, 2007, p. 378).

Nowadays, online reputation should not be neglected by companies owing to the growth of online communication platforms and 2.0 communities (Cuesta, 2013), and the active participation of citizens in these media. Therefore, organizations must take care of and manage their online reputation to be able to relate with all their audience. In this sense, Carrillo-Durán (2016, p. 277) stated that: "the control of online reputation is no longer an option, but a fundamental obligation for decision-making that affects the management of the corporate reputation as a whole."

The company no longer controls what is published about its activity: currently, citizens are not only recipients of information but also have become information providers (Benítez-Eyzaguirre, 2016; Leiva, 2012; Campos-Freire, 2010; Hernández Velasco, 2011).

Some authors such as Benítez-Eyzaguirre (2016), Itoiz (2015), Hernández Velasco (2011) and Garicano (2011) have clarified that online reputation is part of corporate reputation and that it is not limited only to the users' opinion on these platforms.

A key characteristic of online reputation is that the Internet has a multiplier effect on the dissemination of corporate opinion: "it is much more contagious, fast and persistent" (Leiva 2012, p. 17). Moreover, the content disseminated through Social Media, blogs and websites has a permanent, fast, universal and participatory character. Firstly, the information is recorded and it is disseminated quickly (Butterick, 2011). Then, the global scope of such media makes this information available worldwide allowing the equal participation and interaction of different speakers.

If the company aims to relate to its stakeholders to seek social legitimacy, it seems necessary to achieve an active presence in the channels they use. Therefore, we believe that organizations must participate in the dialogue, giving importance both talking and listening: "Online reputation is not only earned by getting positive criticism but allowing those who are not happy with us to express it most directly and easily way possible" (Leiva, 2012, p. 30).

### 2.3. Social Media: tools to facilitate dialogue

The dissemination of CSR by a company aims to obtain social legitimacy by building a favourable image outside the organization itself (Schultz & Wehmeier, 2010; L'Etang, 1994). However, sometimes the communication of the CSR does not succeed and may bring the opposite effect to the desired one (Bachmann & Ingenhoff, 2016; Yoon, Gürhan-Canli, & Schwartz, 2006).

Devin (2016, p. 228) referred to the “half-truth” when companies hide information in their CSR that ends up damaging their image resulting in the loss of the credibility and trust of the public. This phenomenon has been also labeled as corporate hypocrisy (Shim & Yang, 2016; Schultz & Wehmeier, 2010).

For organizations to just act responsibly while they operate is no longer enough. It is also necessary that they inform about their activity to get a positive image outside of them. Companies, through CSR communication, seek to build, strengthen, or restore their reputation with messages that can permeate the public opinion: “Corporate communications, in particular, delivering CSR messages, play a crucial role in forming this CSR reputation, as awareness of corporate CSR activities is the basis of forming such a reputation.” (Sun Young Lee, 2016, p. 436).

Moreover, the communication of CSR should facilitate the participation of stakeholders in decision-making through information exchange (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). By doing so, the tension between the company and the society could be decreased in such a way that social expectations are met, promoting in return cooperation and mutual understanding (Elving *et al.*, 2015).

Companies can communicate their CSR messages through controlled or uncontrolled channels. The former includes CSR reports, corporate websites, commercial advertising or participation in sustainability indexes (Fracarolli & Lee, 2016). These channels give the company control over what is published. On the contrary, Social Media are channels not controlled by the corporation.

Due to external interest, many organizations include in their reports how their commercial operations affect society to justify their activity and improve their reputation. Although CSR reports often collect information on good practices, they raise public skepticism (Sun Young Lee, 2016) as the audience suspects that companies are trying to wash their image behind these reports (Elving *et al.*, 2015).

The excessive publicity of the company and the abundance of information usually leads to the distrust of the audience (Lueg, Rainer, Andersen & Dancianu, 2016). In this sense, Charlas (2012) indicates that the CSR reports must be concise and precise, avoid self-publicity, and choose the topics that respond to the expectations and concerns of the stakeholders.

On the other hand, the Internet has been an essential tool for companies to communicate with their audiences partly due to the immediacy of this platform. Corporate websites have become tools for communicating CSR in a unidirectional way, disclosing positive information about the company to try to influence the perception of the public. Kent and Taylor (2002, p. 31) indicated that web pages should become more interactive and relational spaces that work “dialogically rather than monologically.”

However, websites seem not to be sufficient for communication with the public whereas Social Media offer more opportunities than risks. As indicated by Hernández Velasco (2011, p. 201): “The conversation is on the net, whether you like it or not, so it will always be better to listen to it, engage in it and learn from the expectations it rises.”

The new communication platforms increase connectivity, communication speed, dialogue, and participation of the public in the company. As indicated by Castelló *et al.* (2013, p. 683):

Social Media transform the communicative dynamics within and between corporations and their environment. On the one hand, protest actors can become more powerful and disrupt corporations' legitimacy by using Social Media. On the other hand, corporations can maintain legitimacy better as they can directly relate to their stakeholders via Social Media.

In this line, Kelm *et al.* (2017), Sundstrom and Levenshus (2017), and Smith (2012) pointed out that digital communication contributes to the stakeholder-organization relationship and public dialogue: "Tags, keywords, hashtags, retweets, shares, status updates, blog posts, and comments are all digital footprints of the stakeholder-organizational relationship. Content analyses of such organizational links simultaneously represent the relationship as a dynamic entity and stakeholder perceptions of that entity" (Smith, 2012, p. 842).

Despite Social Media offering a vast range of possibilities for communication, some organizations still use them unidirectionally. Kent and Taylor (2016) propose more interactive communication practices allowing companies to build relationships, achieve understanding and create conditions for trust among their stakeholders: "The defining features of Social Media are that they are relational, involve feedback, and have the potential to take place in real-time" (Kent & Taylor, 2016, p. 62).

Social media is a two-way communication device in ordinary times of commercial activity, as the behavior of the public has changed through the use of the new communication platforms (Castillo & Ponce, 2015). However, at times of crisis it is also relevant as a ready means to broadcast information to the public at large (Cobos & Recoder, 2019a; Losada, 2018; De la Cierva, 2015; Enrique, 2013).

Whether a company decides to use Social Media owes to a number of factors. Kelm, Dohle and Bernhard (2017) pointed out that some factors driving this decision might include resource availability, increase of the audience reached, levels of activity of such audience in these platforms, and the benefits that the use of these tools brings for the company.

### **3. Methods**

The three research questions we intend to answer are:

- Q1. Do Spain's nuclear power plants use Social Media to communicate with the general public?
- Q2. How do communication practitioners in Spain's nuclear power plants perceive the management of Social Media for the atomic energy sector?
- Q3. Are Social Media useful tools for risk industries?

To answer these questions, we worked on the following methodology:

We reviewed the literature on CSR communication, corporate reputation, online reputation, and Social Media to draw a theoretical framework applicable to the atomic energy sector. Some reference works in this field are Kelm *et al.* (2017), Kent and Taylor (2016), Sun Young Lee (2016), Fracarolli and Lee (2016), Itoiz (2015), Smith (2012), and Schultz and Wehmeier (2010).

On the other hand, we reviewed publications on Nuclear Communication to find out if there are recommendations on the use of Social Media in the atomic energy industry. Although there are no standard guidelines on communication in nuclear power plants, some official organizations such as Foratom or the International Atomic Energy Agency have published some general recommendations, especially in times of crisis. However, these recommendations do not include Social Media (Foratom, 2016; IAEA, 1994, 2012).

We studied the use of Social Media as communication tools with the public in nuclear power plants in Spain. To do so, we looked for the profiles of Spanish nuclear power plants in the following Social Media channels: Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Instagram, and YouTube.

Finally, we interviewed the following communication professionals of nuclear power plants in Spain<sup>1</sup>: Antonio Cornadó, communications director of Nuclenor (Santa M<sup>a</sup> de Garoña nuclear power plant); Juan Pedro Alcázar and Antonio Melo<sup>2</sup>, communications managers of CNAT (Almaraz-Trillo nuclear power plants); Montserrat Godall, communications director of ANAV (Ascó-Vandellós nuclear association); Javier Sala, Carlos Gómez and Jesús Cruz, professionals from the communications area of the Cofrentes nuclear power plant. The interviews allowed us to know the position of these professionals regarding the use of Social Media in the nuclear energy sector. Besides, these interviews provided valuable information to learn about the evolution of communication in Spanish nuclear power plants and to open up a new line of research.

#### 4. Results

The Spanish nuclear power plants use their websites as the basic tool for external communication (Cruz, 2017; Sala, 2017; Gómez, 2017; Cornadó, 2016; Godall, 2016; Alcázar, 2016). These web pages are used as a one-way channel to publish the news of the company (Cobos y Recoder, 2019b) such as information about the company, electricity production, events occurred in the facility, notifications to the Nuclear Safety Council as well as information about the management that each plant carries out in terms of safety or environment.

When referring to communication with the general public, the presence of the Spanish nuclear power plants in Social Media such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Instagram, or YouTube<sup>3</sup> is very scarce.

**Table 1:** Existence of official accounts of the Spanish nuclear power plants in Social Media.

	Twitter	Facebook	Instagram	YouTube	LinkedIn
Garoña	-	-	-	-	-
Cofrentes	-	-	-	-	-
CNAT	-	X	-	X	-
ANAV	-	-	-	X	X

Source: Own elaboration.

The Almaraz-Trillo nuclear power plants (CNAT) manage the blog “Energía y Más”<sup>4</sup> [Energy and More] where the company releases information about the area where its plants are located. The blog entries include news, information about the sport, cultural and social events, and information related to the region surrounding Almaraz and Trillo.

This CNAT blog serves as a content platform for the “Energía y Más - Almaraz and Trillo” Facebook page<sup>5</sup>. This Facebook profile includes news and photographs of events related to the region such as local festivals, photo contests, sports competitions, local news, etc. This profile was not created to inform about the functioning of the CNAT plants, but “to talk about everything connected to the communities of Almaraz and Trillo and the things that, as neighbors, we do for our environment”<sup>6</sup>. Despite this claim, since 2018 the CNAT’s Facebook

<sup>1</sup> To enrich this study, we have considered the Santa María de Garoña nuclear power plant which closed down definitively in 2017.

<sup>2</sup> The interview with Antonio Melo was conducted by email.

<sup>3</sup> Last accessed 23/07/20.

<sup>4</sup> The “Energía y Más” blog ([www.energiaymas.es](http://www.energiaymas.es)) was created in 2011.

<sup>5</sup> The Facebook profile was created in December 2011 and has 612 followers (last accessed 23/07/20). The profile can be found at: [www.facebook.com/centralesnuclearesalmaraztrillo](https://www.facebook.com/centralesnuclearesalmaraztrillo).

<sup>6</sup> Available at [www.facebook.com/centralesnuclearesalmaraztrillo/info?tab=page\\_info](https://www.facebook.com/centralesnuclearesalmaraztrillo/info?tab=page_info).

page's growth is due to the number of news items related to the Almaraz and Trillo nuclear power plants themselves.

Moreover, in the description of the CNTA's Facebook page, users are encouraged to participate with comments, suggestions and interests, "in a friendly and cordial manner."

CNAT also manages the "Energía y más Almaraz Trillo" YouTube channel<sup>7</sup>. Users who access this channel can watch videos related to surrounding villages, activities, initiatives, and collaborations in the area of influence of the Almaraz and Trillo plants.

Although the contents in "Energía y más" are little linked to the operation and current affairs of the power plants, we can consider this initiative relevant in Social Media in Spain as it represents the first YouTube channel managed by a nuclear power plant in Spain.

On the other hand, the Ascó-Vandellós Nuclear Association (ANAV) has a profile under construction in LinkedIn with no content published<sup>8</sup>. However, since February 2019, it has a YouTube channel where it posts videos about nuclear science and the operation of the Ascó and Vandellós II nuclear power plants<sup>9</sup>.

Martín Herrero (2015) points out the lack of interest of the nuclear energy sector's participating in the main Social Media channels for society, a matter that is delegated to the companies that own them. This author argues that nuclear power plants "should have Social Media profiles in the platforms most widely used by users, especially Facebook and Twitter so that they can viralize the contents published in their web pages and blogs" (2015, p. 98).

Muñoz (2012) also considers that it is essential that companies and organizations in any security-related industries join the new communication channels used by society. In the same line, Foratom, the European Nuclear Industry Forum, recommended in a 2016 publication (p. 6) to be active in Social Media as a dialogical tool.

Despite these steps towards Social Media, nuclear power plants in Spain still launch informative messages through the communicative platforms of the Spanish Nuclear Industry Forum<sup>10</sup> (Alcázar, 2016). The Nuclear Forum is the body that assumes the communication of the nuclear energy sector in Spain, since the nuclear power plants principally report information of their facilities, usually at the local scale, and do not tackle general issues about nuclear energy.

In this sense, Juan Pedro Alcázar (2016) points out that using the Forum's platforms "has the advantage that, in some cases, your discretion policy doesn't get busted." Table 2 gathers some examples of content published in the Social Media managed by the Nuclear Forum and that make specific reference to the activity of the various nuclear power plants in Spain.

**Table 2** Examples of publications in the Social Media of the Nuclear Forum.

Twitter	<a href="https://twitter.com/ForoNuclear/status/1282567003795066880">https://twitter.com/ForoNuclear/status/1282567003795066880</a>
Facebook	<a href="https://www.facebook.com/foronuclear/posts/2255308027948773">https://www.facebook.com/foronuclear/posts/2255308027948773</a>
LinkedIn	<a href="https://www.linkedin.com/posts/foro-de-la-industria-nuclear-espa%C3%B1ola_el-organismo-regulador-favorable-a-la-continuidad-activity-6681533054424502272-gA0T">https://www.linkedin.com/posts/foro-de-la-industria-nuclear-espa%C3%B1ola_el-organismo-regulador-favorable-a-la-continuidad-activity-6681533054424502272-gA0T</a>
YouTube	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RRjkljMco-0">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RRjkljMco-0</a>
Instagram	<a href="https://www.instagram.com/p/CApe2UxqE9b/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link">https://www.instagram.com/p/CApe2UxqE9b/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link</a>

Source: Own elaboration.

<sup>7</sup> The "Energía y más Almaraz Trillo" channel on YouTube was created in January 2012: [www.youtube.com/user/ENERGIAYMAS](http://www.youtube.com/user/ENERGIAYMAS). Last accessed 07/23/20.

<sup>8</sup> This profile is available at <https://www.linkedin.com/company/anav-asociaci-n-nuclear-asc--vandell-s-/about/>

<sup>9</sup> See <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCAcNyEofyJD9o0RS3RQUGMQ>.

<sup>10</sup> This sectorial lobby has profiles in Social Media such as Facebook ([www.facebook.com/foronuclear/](http://www.facebook.com/foronuclear/)), Twitter (@ForoNuclear), YouTube ([www.youtube.com/user/ForoNuclear](http://www.youtube.com/user/ForoNuclear)), LinkedIn ([www.linkedin.com/company/10414768/](http://www.linkedin.com/company/10414768/)) or Instagram where it actively published content.

Antonio Cornadó (2016), former Director of Communication at Nuclenor and ex-president of the Nuclear Forum, insists on the support that the lobby provides to the plants regarding communication through Social Media:

We [the Nuclear Forum] are highly active in Social Media and we are going to increase such presence this year as we believe it is the way to ensure relevance in the public opinion. Each plant has already made its decision and we must also understand that Social Media are like a coin with two sides. One side is very attractive and proactive [...] but the other side involves the risk of being criticized.

The communication managers of the Spanish plants point out the necessity to be clear about the role that a nuclear power plant could play in Social Media, the importance of feeding these channels constantly and proactively, and the risk that this communication activity could pose:

Social Media require dedication and presence. Signing up for a Twitter account to publish nothing does not make much sense [...] you can get questions, you can have issues that if you don't resolve, you're doing it very badly (Godall, 2016).

Social Media generally bring debate, controversy and it is not our business neither our goal. We aim to present our data in the most transparent way possible and we do that on the web (Sala, 2017).

If we were present in Social Media, we would end up justifying our activity every day and replying more than informing. In the end, this would become a war of tweets, Instagram, Facebook and the rest of the platforms (Gómez, 2017).

Two sides of the same coin. I believe that if you are in Social Media you have to assume all the consequences. [...]. For me, for example, Twitter does not disturb me too much because on Twitter you can have a "no-dialogue" account (that is what we do here [Nuclear Forum]). Facebook has another feature. In the beginning, I was not very supportive of it because I thought it was quite risky. But the truth is that Facebook is working quite well, [but]for Garoña or [any other] nuclear power plant I do not think it fits (Cornadó, 2016).

## **5. Conclusion**

The high-risk industries are usually very unpopular among the public because society believes that when analyzing the risk-benefit balance, it does not pay out. For example, people remember the negative aftereffects of nuclear, biotechnological, mining, pharmaceutical, and other events, but they fail to weigh the probability of such events occurring, partly because only the experts have the capacity and training necessary for assessing such probabilities.

Organizations whose production involves high risks must make a communication effort to integrate the exercise of their industrial activity in the society in which they operate. Social acceptance is not gained as a result of communication tactics or Institutional Relations practices –but rather, it comes as a result of a time-sustained responsible activity and adequate and timely communication to stakeholders of business behaviour.

Spanish nuclear power plants use websites as their main external communication tool. Their communication managers believe that the use of Social Media in their industries can actually bring in more risks than benefits for their image. For this reason, they do not have an active presence in these platforms.

However, nuclear power plants in Spain have surrendered online communication to the Spanish Nuclear Industry Forum. This lobby –whose main function is to defend the interests of the nuclear industry as a whole– launches specific messages and news from each plant in their own Social Media profiles.

We believe that nuclear power plants, as well as other high-risk industries (e.g., petrochemical or pharmaceutical companies), should create profiles on Social Media and use them as tools for information, dissemination and dialogue with the public that widely use those platforms.



We think that if the plants do not realize the widespread usage of Social Media, they will be limited in the dissemination of information. This will entail missing user feedback that could result in improved commercial strategies; losing the possibility of transmitting the company's mission and identity; failing to respond to criticism directly; and giving up disseminating the science they do and the opportunity of opening up a debate where consensus, new prescribers and influence could be sought.

We believe that dialogue should be the guiding principle of Nuclear Communication. Opinion polls have shown that social acceptance in the nuclear sector improves when the public is informed. Moreover, the viability of the nuclear industry depends on certain interest groups that are critical to each installation, such as the regulatory body, the government or the company that owns it, and other groups that influence public opinions such as opposition groups or the media (Cobos & Recoder, 2019c).

We consider that it is important for high-risk industries (e.g., nuclear power plants) to devise an online strategy that allows them to communicate their identity and gather the interest of the users. For this purpose, it seems necessary to have a communication professional (i.e., community manager) capable of designing the organization's online strategy: firstly, to carry out annual information campaigns on the web and Social Media with periodic publications in these platforms, and secondly, to monitor the activity of such channels.

The challenge faced by high-risk industries is to use all the channels to understand and know the interests and concerns of the public, which will allow them to make better business decisions.

In this exercise of openness to dialogue, organizations must be willing to be transparent about their activities, resolving any doubts that may arise from their relationships with multiple audiences, alleviating conflicts that come with a true disposition to listen and strengthening messages with positive arguments. To achieve this target, it seems necessary to use Social Media.

High-risk companies share some features: they are strictly regulated industries, they have low social acceptance, and their production involves dangers to community health or the environment. Even though the research field of strategic communication in these types of companies does not have a wide theoretical development, efforts must continue to find effective ways to disseminate science to society. Society must understand the importance and repercussions that this production towards the common good. Dialogue is the communicative principle that will make consensus possible, and, to achieve this, the use of new forms of communication is necessary.

## References

- Alcázar, Juan Pedro. Jefe de Comunicación de CNAT (2016). Entrevista en profundidad: Sede corporativa Centrales Nucleares Almaraz-Trillo (Madrid), December 21, 2016.
- Bachmann, P. & Ingenhoff, D. (2016). Legitimacy through CSR disclosures? The advantage outweighs the disadvantages. *Public Relations Review*, 42(3), 386–394.  
<https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.02.008>
- Balmer, J. M. & Gray, E. R. (1998). Managing Corporate Image and Corporate Reputation. *Long Range Planning*, 31(5), 695–702. [https://www.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301\(98\)00074-0](https://www.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(98)00074-0)
- Balmer, J. M. & Worcester, R. (2009). Reflections on corporate reputations. *Management Decision*, 47(4), 573–589.
- Benítez-Eyzaguirre, L. (2016). Análisis de la recomendación entre iguales en la reputación online de las organizaciones. *El Profesional de la Información*, 25(4), 652–660.  
<https://www.doi.org/10.3145/epi.2016.jul.15>

- Broon, P. S. (2007). Relationships outcomes as determinants of reputation. *Corporate Communication: An International Journal*, 12(4), 376–393.  
<https://www.doi.org/10.1108/13563280710832524>
- Butterick, K. (2011). *Introducing public relations: theory and practice*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Campos-Freire, F. (2010). La gestión de la “conversación” mediática y la reputación *on line*. *Chasqui*, 112, 36–44. <https://www.doi.org/10.16921/chasqui.voi112.302>
- Carrillo-Durán, M. V. (2016). Importancia del profesional de la información en la dirección de comunicación de las organizaciones. *El Profesional de la Información*, 25(2), 272–278.  
<https://www.doi.org/10.3145/epi.2016.mar.14>
- Caruana, A. (1997). Corporate reputation: concept and measurement. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 6(2), 109–118.
- Castelló, I., Morsing, M. & Schultz, F. (2013). Communicative Dynamics and the Polyphony of Corporate Social Responsibility in the Network Society. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118(4), 683–694. <https://www.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1954-1>
- Castillo, A. & Ponce, D. G. (2015). *Comunicación de crisis 2.0*. Madrid: Fragua.
- Chaarlas, L. J. (2012). Utilitarianism in CSR Reporting: The Maximum Good for Stakeholders. *Journal of Economic Development, Management, IT, Finance & Marketing*, 4(1), 38–48.
- Cobos, E. (2017). La energía nuclear en España y el bien común: el diálogo como propuesta comunicativa para la aceptación social. *Ruta Comunicación*, 8, 27–44.
- Cobos, E. & Recoder, M. J. (2019a). La comunicación de crisis en el sector atómico: protocolo, características, y recomendaciones en eventos nucleares. *Revista Española de Comunicación en Salud (RECS). Monográfico sobre Periodismo y comunicación en situaciones de crisis, emergencias y desastres*, 19–29. <https://www.doi.org/10.20318/recs.2019.4372>
- Cobos, E. & Recoder, M. J. (2019b). Modelo de análisis web para centrales nucleares: estudio del caso de España. *Estudios sobre el Mensaje Periodístico*, 25(2), 727–745.  
<https://www.doi.org/10.5209/esmp.64799>
- Cobos, E. & Recoder, M. J. (2019c). La imagen de la energía nuclear en la prensa española de proximidad: ¿Son los medios de comunicación un *stakeholder* relevante para el sector atómico? *Anàlisi: Quaderns de comunicació i cultura*, 61, 31–53.  
<https://www.doi.org/10.5565/rev/analisi.3181>
- Cornadó, Antonio. Director de Comunicación de Nuclenor y Presidente del Foro Nuclear (2013–2017). Entrevista en profundidad: Foro de la Industria Nuclear Española (Madrid), December 21, 2016.
- Cruz, Jesús. Responsable de Comunicación de Cofrentes (1984–2015). Entrevista en profundidad: Valencia, February 16, 2017.
- Cuesta, U. (2013). Fundamentos psicosociales de la reputación *online*: propuesta de un modelo y un caso de análisis. *Estudios sobre el mensaje periodístico*, 19(2), 691–700.  
[https://www.doi.org/10.5209/rev\\_ESMP.2013.v19.42152](https://www.doi.org/10.5209/rev_ESMP.2013.v19.42152)
- De la Cierva, Y. (2015). *Comunicar en aguas turbulentas. Un enfoque ético para la comunicación de crisis*. Pamplona: EUNSA.
- Devin, B. (2016). Half-truths and dirty secrets: Omissions in CSR communication. *Public Relations Review*, 42, 226–228. <https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.09.004>
- Elving, W. J. L., Golob, U., Podnar, K., Ellerup-Nielsen, A. & Thomson, C. (2015). The bad, the ugly and the good: new challenges for CSR communication. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 20(2), 118–127. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-02-2015-0006>
- Enrique Jiménez, A. M. (2013). La gestión de comunicación de crisis en las redes sociales. *Orbis. Revista científica ciencias humanas*, 8(24), 116–131.
- Fombrun, C. J. & Rindova, V. (2000). Reputation as strategy. In M. Schultz, M. J. Hatch & M. H. Larsen. *The Expressive Organization. Linking identity, reputation and the corporate brand* (pp. 73–93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foratom (2016). *Guidelines on stakeholder dialogue*. Brussels: Foratom.

- Fracarolli Nunes, M. & Lee Park, C. (2016). Self-claimed sustainability: Building social and environmental reputations with words. *Sustainable Production and Consumption* 1-12. <https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2016.04.002>
- Garicano, T. (2011). El gobierno corporativo y la reputación corporativa. In J. Villafane (Ed.), *La comunicación empresarial y la gestión de los intangibles en España y Latinoamérica* (pp. 189-195). Madrid: Pearson Educación.
- Godall, Monserrat. Directora de Comunicación de ANAV (2016). Entrevista en profundidad: Central Nuclear de Vandellós I (Tarragona), November 3, 2016.
- Gómez, Carlos. Responsable del Centro de Información de Cofrentes (2017). Entrevista en profundidad: Central Nuclear de Cofrentes, February 17, 2017.
- Greyser, S. A. (1999). Advancing and enhancing corporate reputation. *Communications: An International Journal*, 4(4), 177-181. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/13563289910299292>
- Grunig, J. E. (1993). Image and substance: From symbolic to behavioral relationships. *Public Relations Review* 19(2), 121-139. [https://www.doi.org/10.1016/0363-8111\(93\)90003-U](https://www.doi.org/10.1016/0363-8111(93)90003-U)
- Grunig J. E. & Hung C. F (2002). The effect of relationships on reputation and reputation on relationships: a cognitive behavioral study, Paper presented for the 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Educator's Academy, Public Relations Society of America. Miami, FL.
- Heath, R. L. (2011). External Organizational Rhetoric: Bridging Management and Sociopolitical Discourse. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 415-435. <https://www.doi.org/10.1177/0893318911409532>
- Hernández Velasco, J. (2011). Reputación *online*: necesidad de un marco conceptual y un modelo de gestión. In J. Villafane (Ed.), *La comunicación empresarial y la gestión de los intangibles en España y Latinoamérica* (pp. 197-214). Madrid: Pearson Educación.
- IAEA (1994). Nuclear communications: a handbook for guiding good communications practices at nuclear fuel cycle facilities. Wien: Internat. Atomic Energy Agency.
- IAEA (2012). Manual de Operaciones para la Comunicación de Incidentes y Emergencias. Wien: International Atomic Energy Agency.
- Itoiz, M. (2015). En la era digital, ¿reputación o reputación *online*? In *El nuevo diálogo social: organizaciones, públicos y ciudadanos* (pp. 137-148). Valencia: Campgràfic.
- Kantanen, H. (2012). Identity, image and stakeholder dialogue. *Corporate Communications*, 17(1), 56-72. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/13563281211196353>
- Kelm, O., Dohle, M. & Bernhard, U. (2017). Social Media Activities of Political Communication Practitioners: The Impact of Strategic Orientation and In-Group Orientation. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 1-18. <https://www.doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2017.1323756>
- Kent, M. L. & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 28(1), 21-37. [https://www.doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111\(02\)00108-X](https://www.doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00108-X)
- Kent, M. L. & Taylor, M. (2016). From Homo Economicus to Homo dialogicus: Rethinking social media use in CSR communication. *Public Relations Review*, 42(1), 60-67. <https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.11.003>
- Leiva, J. (2012). Gestión de la reputación *online*: crea fácilmente tu estrategia de presencia en la red. Barcelona: UOC.
- L'Etang, J. (1994). Public relations and Corporate Social Responsibility: Some Issues Arising. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13(2), 111-123. <https://www.doi.org/10.1007/BF00881580>
- Losada Díaz, J. C. (2018). (NO) crisis. Comunicación de crisis en un mundo conectado. Barcelona: UOC.
- Lueg, K., Rainer, L., Andersen, K. & Dancianu, V. (2016). Integrated reporting with CSR practices: A pragmatic constructivist case study in a Danish cultural setting. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 21(1), 20-35. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-08-2014-0053>

- Martín Herrero, J. M. (2015). La Imagen de la energía nuclear en España. Características, causas y soluciones de futuro de la industria energética en las relaciones sociales. TFM. Madrid: Universidad Camilo José Cela.
- Melo, Antonio. Director de Organización y Recursos Humanos de CNAT. Interview by email, January 25, 2017.
- Morsing, M. & Schultz, M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility communication: stakeholder information, response and involvement strategies. *Business Ethics: A European Review* 4, 323-338. <https://www.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8608.2006.00460.x>
- Muñoz, N. (2012). La seguridad nuclear en el siglo XXI: transparencia y pedagogía informativas. *Economía Industrial*, 384, 33-36.
- O'Connor, A. (2005). Reputation Management. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of public relations. Vol. II* (pp. 745-746). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pruzan, P. (2001). Corporate reputation: image and identity. *Corporate Reputation Review* 4(1), 50-64. <https://www.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540132>
- Sala, Javier. Portavoz de Cofrentes y Jefe de Producción (2017). Entrevista en profundidad: Central Nuclear de Cofrentes, February 17, 2017.
- Schultz, F. & Wehmeier, S. (2010). Institutionalization of corporate social responsibility within corporate communications: Combining institutional, sensemaking and communication perspectives. *Corporate Communications* 15(1), 9-29. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/13563281011016813>
- Shim, K.v & Yang, S. (2016). The effect of bad reputation: The occurrence of crisis, corporate social responsibility, and perceptions of hypocrisy and attitudes toward a company. *Public Relations Review*, 42, 68-78. <https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.11.009>
- Smith, B. G. (2012). Public relations identity and the stakeholder-organization relationship: A revised theoretical position for public relations scholarship. *Public Relations Review*, 38(5), 838-845. <https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.06.011>
- Sun Young Lee (2016). How can companies succeed in forming CSR reputation? *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 21(4), 435-449. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-01-2016-0009>
- Sundstrom, B. & Levenshus, A.B. (2017). The art of engagement: dialogic strategies on Twitter. *Journal of Communication Management*, 21(1), 17-33. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-07-2015-0057>
- Vallentin, S. (2009). Private management and public opinion: Corporate social responsiveness revisited. *Business and Society*, 48(1), 60-87. <https://www.doi.org/10.1177/0007650307300443>
- Verčič, A. T., Verčič, D. & Žnidar, K. (2016). Exploring academic reputation—is it a multidimensional construct? *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* 21(2), 160-176. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-01-2015-0003>
- Villafañe, J. (2004). La buena reputación: claves del valor intangible de las empresas. Madrid: Pirámide.
- Walker, K. (2010). A systematic review of the corporate reputation literature: Definition, measurement, and theory. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 12(4), 357-387. <https://www.doi.org/10.1057/crr.2009.26>
- Weigelt, K. & Camerer, C. (1988). Reputation and Corporate Strategy: A Review of Recent Theory and Applications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9(5), 443-454. <https://www.doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250090505>
- Yoon, Y., Gürhan-Canli, Z. & Schwartz, N. (2006). The effect of corporate social responsibility activities on companies with bad reputations. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16(4), 377-390. [https://www.doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1604\\_9](https://www.doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1604_9)