DIGITAL PR COMPETENCE OF REGIONAL INFORMATION SERVICES: CRISIS COMMUNICATION AND REPUTATION MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Qahhorova O'g'iloy Norchayevna
O'zbekiston jurnalistika va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar universiteti,
To'gon va Qudrat Ernazarovlar nomidagi
Jamoatchilik bilan aloqalar kafedrasi o'qituvchisi
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5875-1427
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22109822

Annotatsiya: Maqolada hududiy davlat boshqaruvi va jamoatchilik bilan aloqalar tizimida faoliyat yurituvchi axborot xizmatlarining raqamli PR-kompetensiyasi, inqirozli kommunikatsiyani tashkil etish va institutsional reputatsiyani boshqarish masalalari tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotning dolzarbligi raqamli axborot muhitining tezkorligi, ijtimoiy tarmoqlarda xabarlarning qisqa vaqt ichida keng auditoriyaga tarqalishi, noto‘g‘ri va chalg‘ituvchi axborotlarning reputatsion xatarlarga aylanishi bilan belgilanadi. Tadqiqotda ilmiy adabiyotlar tahlili, qiyosiy tahlil, kontent-tahlil, tizimli yondashuv, konseptual modellashtirish va ekspertik baholash metodlaridan foydalanish taklif etiladi. Raqamli PR-kompetensiya axborotni yaratish va tarqatish ko‘nikmasi bilan cheklanmasdan, auditoriyani segmentatsiyalash, raqamli monitoring, ma’lumotlarga asoslangan kommunikatsiya, inqirozga tezkor javob berish, dezinformatsiyani aniqlash, vizual kommunikatsiya, platformalararo integratsiya va reputatsion risklarni boshqarish kompetensiyalarining majmuasi sifatida talqin qilinadi. Tadqiqot natijasida hududiy axborot xizmatlari uchun “monitoring – riskni baholash – tezkor javob – dialog – reputatsiyani tiklash – monitoring” tamoyiliga asoslangan integrativ model taklif etiladi. Modelning amaliy ahamiyati hududiy davlat tashkilotlarining raqamli kommunikatsiya samaradorligini baholash uchun aniq indikatorlardan foydalanish imkoniyatida namoyon bo‘ladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: hududiy axborot xizmati, raqamli PR, PR-kompetensiya, inqirozli kommunikatsiya, reputatsiyani boshqarish, raqamli monitoring, ijtimoiy media, jamoatchilik bilan aloqalar, dezinformatsiya, institutsional ishonch.

ЦИФРОВАЯ PR-КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТЬ РЕГИОНАЛЬНЫХ ИНФОРМАЦИОННЫХ СЛУЖБ: ПРАКТИКА КРИЗИСНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ И УПРАВЛЕНИЯ РЕПУТАЦИЕЙ

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье рассматриваются вопросы цифровой PR-компетентности региональных информационных служб, организации кризисной коммуникации и управления институциональной репутацией в условиях трансформации цифровой информационной среды. Актуальность исследования определяется высокой скоростью распространения информации в социальных сетях, усилением рисков дезинформации и необходимостью поддержания доверия граждан к государственным институтам. В исследовании применяются методы анализа научной литературы, сравнительного анализа, контент-анализа, системного подхода, концептуального моделирования и экспертной оценки. Цифровая PR-компетентность рассматривается как комплекс профессиональных способностей, включающий не только создание и распространение информационных материалов, но и сегментацию аудитории, цифровой мониторинг, data-driven communication, оперативное реагирование на кризисные ситуации, выявление дезинформации, визуальную коммуникацию, межплатформенную интеграцию и управление репутационными рисками. В результате предлагается интегративная модель цифровой кризисной коммуникации региональных информационных служб, основанная на последовательности «мониторинг – оценка риска – оперативный ответ – диалог – восстановление репутации – повторный мониторинг». Практическая значимость модели заключается в возможности использования измеримых

показателей для оценки эффективности цифровых коммуникаций региональных государственных организаций.

Ключевые слова: региональная информационная служба, цифровой PR, PR-компетентность, кризисная коммуникация, управление репутацией, цифровой мониторинг, социальные медиа, связи с общественностью, дезинформация, институциональное доверие.

HUDUDIY AXBOROT XIZMATLARINING RAQAMLI PR-KOMPETENSIYASI: INQIROZLI MULOQOT VA REPUTATSIYANI BOSHQARISH AMALIYOTI

Abstract

This article examines the digital public relations competence of regional information services, with particular attention to crisis communication and institutional reputation management in an increasingly digital information environment. The relevance of the study is determined by the speed and scale of information dissemination through social media, the growing risks associated with misinformation and disinformation, and the need to maintain public trust in government institutions. The study applies literature review, comparative analysis, content analysis, a systems approach, conceptual modelling, and expert assessment. Digital PR competence is conceptualised not merely as the ability to produce and distribute information, but as an integrated set of professional competencies including audience segmentation, digital monitoring, data-driven communication, rapid crisis response, misinformation detection, visual communication, cross-platform integration, stakeholder engagement, and reputation risk management. The study proposes an integrative model for digital crisis communication in regional information services based on the sequence of "monitoring – risk assessment – rapid response – dialogue – reputation recovery – continuous monitoring." The practical value of the proposed model lies in the possibility of evaluating digital communication performance through measurable indicators, including response speed, audience engagement, information reach, sentiment dynamics, correction effectiveness, transparency, and institutional trust.

Keywords: regional information service, digital PR, PR competence, crisis communication, reputation management, digital monitoring, social media, public relations, misinformation, institutional trust.

1. INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of public administration has fundamentally changed the relationship between public institutions and citizens. Communication that was previously organised primarily through traditional media, press conferences, official statements and printed information materials is increasingly conducted through websites, social networks, messaging platforms, video services and other digital channels. As a result, regional information services are no longer limited to the conventional function of distributing official information. They increasingly operate as strategic communication units responsible for monitoring the information environment, interpreting public reactions, managing institutional narratives and responding to reputational risks.

The contemporary information environment is characterised by speed, fragmentation and high levels of audience participation. A message published by a regional public institution can be reproduced, commented on, criticised or transformed by users within minutes. Consequently, communication competence has become an important organisational resource.

The purpose of this study is to theoretically substantiate the structure of digital PR competence of regional information services and to develop an integrative approach to crisis communication and reputation management in the digital environment.

The objectives of the study are:

1. to clarify the conceptual content of digital PR competence in regional information services;
2. to identify the major components of digital crisis communication;
3. to determine the relationship between crisis communication and institutional reputation;
4. to propose an integrative model for digital communication management;
5. to develop measurable indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of regional information services.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methodological framework of the study is based on the integration of public relations theory, strategic communication, crisis communication, digital media studies, reputation management and public governance.

2.1. Theoretical analysis

Scientific literature concerning public relations, strategic communication, crisis communication, reputation management and digital government communication was analysed. Particular attention was paid to the transformation of public communication from one-way information dissemination toward interactive and citizen-centred communication.

2.2. Comparative analysis

Comparative analysis was used to identify common principles of crisis communication and digital reputation management in public institutions. International approaches were compared according to communication speed, transparency, accessibility, evidence-based messaging, stakeholder engagement, digital monitoring, misinformation response, consistency across communication channels and post-crisis evaluation.

2.3. Content analysis

Content analysis can be applied to official websites, Telegram channels, Facebook pages, Instagram accounts, YouTube channels and other digital platforms operated by regional institutions. The following indicators are particularly important: frequency of publications, response time, type of content, level of audience engagement, number of comments and reactions, response to negative comments, correction of inaccurate information, use of visual content, crisis-related publications and consistency of messages across platforms.

2.4. Digital monitoring

Digital monitoring is interpreted as a continuous process of identifying public discussions, emerging risks, negative narratives, misinformation and changes in audience sentiment. The monitoring cycle may be represented as: Information environment → Monitoring → Risk identification → Verification → Strategic response → Audience reaction → Reputation assessment.

2.5. Conceptual modelling

A conceptual model was developed to integrate three dimensions: digital PR competence; crisis communication capacity; reputation management capacity. The model assumes that the three dimensions are interdependent.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Digital PR competence as a strategic organisational capability

Digital PR competence should not be understood merely as technical knowledge of social media platforms. It is an integrated professional capability enabling an information service to plan, produce, distribute, monitor and evaluate strategic communication through digital channels.

The proposed structure includes seven components:

1. Strategic competence – communication planning and goal setting.
2. Content competence – creation of accurate, accessible and relevant content.
3. Analytical competence – monitoring data, audience behaviour and sentiment.
4. Technological competence – effective use of digital platforms and tools.
5. Crisis competence – rapid response and crisis message management.
6. Dialogue competence – interaction with citizens and stakeholders.
7. Reputation competence – protection and restoration of institutional reputation.

3.2. Crisis communication in the digital environment

A digital crisis differs from a traditional communication crisis primarily in its speed, visibility and participatory nature. In social media environments, public discussion can begin almost immediately after an incident occurs. This creates a fundamental communication requirement: speed must be combined with accuracy.

Regional information services require a crisis communication protocol based on five principles: speed, accuracy, transparency, consistency and dialogue.

3.3. Crisis communication cycle

The proposed crisis communication cycle consists of six stages:

Stage 1. Continuous monitoring.

Stage 2. Risk identification.

Stage 3. Verification.

Stage 4. Rapid response.

Stage 5. Dialogue.

Stage 6. Reputation recovery.

3.4. Reputation management in digital communication

Institutional reputation is a long-term asset that can be damaged rapidly but usually requires considerable time to rebuild. Digital reputation is influenced by information quality, transparency, responsiveness, service experience, media visibility and citizen feedback.

The digital environment also makes reputation measurable. Indicators such as sentiment, engagement, response time, media tone, complaint resolution and audience trust can provide valuable information for decision-makers.

3.5. Proposed integrative model

DIGITAL MONITORING
↓
AUDIENCE AND RISK ANALYSIS
↓
CRISIS IDENTIFICATION
↓
FACT VERIFICATION
↓
STRATEGIC MESSAGE DEVELOPMENT
↓
MULTI-PLATFORM DISTRIBUTION
↓
STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUE
↓
SENTIMENT AND REPUTATION MONITORING
↓
REPUTATION RECOVERY
↓
POST-CRISIS EVALUATION

The model is cyclical rather than linear. After reputation evaluation, monitoring continues, allowing the organisation to identify new risks and improve future communication.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that the effectiveness of regional information services increasingly depends on the transition from a traditional “information distribution” model toward a strategic “communication management” model.

The traditional model can be represented as:

Institution → Message → Media → Audience.

The digital model is considerably more complex:

Institution ↔ Digital platforms ↔ Citizens ↔ Media ↔ Influencers ↔ Stakeholders.

The first opportunity is direct communication. The second opportunity is real-time feedback. The third opportunity is audience segmentation. The fourth opportunity is data-driven communication.

At the same time, several risks emerge: inaccurate information, misinformation, emotionally charged content, inconsistent messages and technological risks.

Therefore, digital PR competence should include not only technological literacy but also ethical, analytical and strategic capabilities.

Crisis communication and reputation management should not be separated. Crisis communication represents one of the most visible tests of institutional reputation. An organisation that communicates rapidly, transparently and respectfully during a crisis can strengthen public confidence even when the underlying problem itself is serious.

4.1. Digital PR performance indicators

The following KPI system is proposed:

1. Response Time – time between emergence of a crisis and official response.
2. Information Reach – number of users exposed to official information.
3. Engagement Rate – reactions, comments, shares and other interactions.
4. Response Rate – percentage of relevant public questions receiving responses.
5. Correction Speed – time required to correct inaccurate information.
6. Sentiment Index – ratio of positive, neutral and negative mentions.
7. Message Consistency – degree of consistency across digital platforms.
8. Transparency Index – availability of evidence, sources and explanations.
9. Reputation Recovery Rate – change in sentiment after crisis management.
10. Trust Indicator – change in audience confidence in the institution.

4.2. Practical recommendations for regional information services

1. Develop a written digital crisis communication protocol.
2. Establish a permanent digital monitoring system.
3. Introduce a rapid verification mechanism.
4. Maintain a stakeholder database.
5. Train communication staff in crisis communication, social media analytics and misinformation detection.
6. Introduce response-time targets for different categories of crisis.
7. Develop platform-specific content strategies.
8. Use visual communication, infographics and short-form video.
9. Develop a post-crisis evaluation procedure.
10. Integrate reputation indicators into performance assessment.
11. Strengthen evidence-based communication.
12. Maintain continuous dialogue with citizens.

5. CONCLUSION

The digital transformation of public communication has fundamentally expanded the responsibilities of regional information services. Their role is no longer limited to transmitting official information. They increasingly function as strategic communication actors responsible for monitoring the information environment, engaging citizens, responding to crises and protecting institutional reputation.

The study demonstrates that digital PR competence should be regarded as an integrated professional capability consisting of strategic, content, analytical, technological, crisis, dialogue and reputation-management competencies.

The proposed integrative model — monitoring, risk identification, verification, strategic response, multi-platform distribution, dialogue, reputation monitoring and recovery — provides a systematic framework for organising digital crisis communication at the regional level.

Reputation management should not be considered an isolated PR activity. Institutional reputation is continuously formed through information quality, transparency, responsiveness, citizen experience and crisis performance.

Therefore, the development of digital PR competence should become an integral part of professional development programmes for regional information services. Particular emphasis should be placed on

digital monitoring, crisis preparedness, data-driven communication, misinformation management, stakeholder dialogue and reputation analytics.

REFERENCES

1. Coombs W. T. Ongoing Crisis Communication: Planning, Managing, and Responding. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2022.
2. Coombs W. T. Protecting organization reputations during a crisis: The development and application of Situational Crisis Communication Theory. Corporate Reputation Review. 2007. Vol. 10. No. 3. P. 163–176.
3. Coombs W. T., Holladay S. J. The Handbook of Crisis Communication. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
4. Cutlip S. M., Center A. H., Broom G. M. Effective Public Relations. 11th ed. Pearson, 2013.
5. Grunig J. E., Hunt T. Managing Public Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984.
6. Hallahan K., Holtzhausen D., van Ruler B., Verčič D., Sriramesh K. Defining strategic communication. International Journal of Strategic Communication. 2007. Vol. 1. No. 1. P. 3–35.
7. Kent M. L., Taylor M. Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. Public Relations Review. 2002. Vol. 28. No. 1. P. 21–37.
8. Fearn-Banks K. Crisis Communications: A Casebook Approach. 5th ed. New York: Routledge, 2017.
9. Argenti P. A. Corporate Communication. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Education, 2016.
10. Doorley J., Garcia H. F. Reputation Management: The Key to Successful Public Relations and Corporate Communication. 4th ed. New York: Routledge, 2020.
11. OECD. OECD Report on Public Communication: The Global Context and the Way Forward. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1787/22f8031c-en.
12. OECD. OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions – 2024 Results: Building Trust in a Complex Policy Environment. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1787/9a20554b-en.
13. OECD. Trust and Information Integrity. In: OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions – 2024 Results. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2024.
14. OECD. Government Communication. OECD Public Governance. 2024–2026.
15. OECD. Good Practice Principles on Public Communication Responses to Mis- and Disinformation. Paris: OECD, 2021.
16. UNESCO. Journalism, “Fake News” and Disinformation: Handbook for Journalism Education and Training. Paris: UNESCO, 2018.
17. Castells M. Communication Power. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
18. van Dijck J., Poell T., de Waal M. The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
19. Kietzmann J. H., Hermkens K., McCarthy I. P., Silvestre B. S. Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. Business Horizons. 2011. Vol. 54. No. 3. P. 241–251.
20. Kaplan A. M., Haenlein M. Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. Business Horizons. 2010. Vol. 53. No. 1. P. 59–68.
21. Austin L., Liu B. F., Jin Y. How audiences seek out crisis information: Exploring the social-mediated crisis communication model. Journal of Applied Communication Research. 2012. Vol. 40. No. 2. P. 188–207.
22. Liu B. F., Austin L., Jin Y. How publics respond to crisis communication strategies: The interplay of information form and source. Public Relations Review. 2011. Vol. 37. No. 3. P. 345–353.
23. Vosoughi S., Roy D., Aral S. The spread of true and false news online. Science. 2018. Vol. 359. No. 6380. P. 1146–1151.
24. Allcott H., Gentzkow M. Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. Journal of Economic Perspectives. 2017. Vol. 31. No. 2. P. 211–236.
25. Matasick C., Alfonsi C., Bellantoni A. Governments and Citizens in the Post-Truth Era: Public Communication and Information Integrity. OECD Working Papers on Public Governance. Paris: OECD, 2020.