

CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND IT AFFECTS ON BRAND REPUTATION: A CASE STUDY OF CAMBRIDGE ANALYTICA CRISIS ON FACEBOOK

Sara Zaid Tariq Tariq¹, Akin Marşap²

¹Department of Business Administration/ Istanbul Aydin university / Turkey

²Department of Business Administration/ Istanbul Aydin university / Turkey

Abstract: The study consisted of theoretical part. Aim of theoretical part is to clarify the role of social media who has helped the society in dissolving traditional boundaries, especially by creating a sense of proximity between consumers and brands, with the growth of social media networks, such as Facebook, our privacy has become regularly more exposed, companies like Cambridge Analytica a political consulting firm collected personal information from participants who believed they were taking some personal test but rather, the information was used to derive other politically useful aspects. it has push companies to be more susceptible to potentially damaging situations. Brands often make promises, but when such promises are not fulfilled, the brand is affected in one way or the other. the empirical part aims were: examine the crisis management process and its effect on brand reputation, evaluate the significance of crisis management as well as brand reputation, examine the impact of Cambridge Analytica crisis on Facebook as well as its users, investigate why people, turn to over use specific social medias than others, examine the importance of privacy concerns in organizations or brands. Finally investigate the crisis management policies adopted by the organization.

Keywords: Crises Management, Brand Repetition, Facebook.

I. INTRODUCTION

Crisis management represent a handful of disciplines in science, social science, engineering, medicine etc. to handle unforeseen events. This research is more focus in the area of social sciences. Crisis as the name entails can happen at any time, everywhere and to everybody (Mitroff and Anagnos 2001: 3-4). Crisis are part of our daily lives, though some people believe that these unexpected events can't happen to them (Regester and Larkin 2005: 142).

Before looking deeply into the seeing the effect of crisis management and its effect on brand reputation, it is important to have an understanding of crises per se. According to the Institute for Crisis Management (ICM, 2016: 1), a crisis in the context of business can be defined as "any issue, problem or disruption which triggers negative stakeholder reactions that impact the organization's business and financial strength." There are four different main types of business crisis: perceptual, sudden, bizarre and smoldering. A perceptual crisis is the that does not state a real problem to the company itself, but people perceive there's one. Sudden crisis constitutes accidents or violence, natural disasters within the workplace prior warning, which however becomes a disruption to the company's operations. Bizarre crises are situations which are difficult to believe by those involved and are unimaginable and unpredictable. This nevertheless have to be managed. Lastly, smoldering crisis are situations which are potentially harmful to the company, considered to be known or should be known by at least a portion of the people within the organization, but ignored and nothing done about it (ICM 2016: 1).

From their knowledge of the origin of crisis, Hammerich and Lewis came up with eight main sources most crisis originates: success, change of leadership, poor strategy in facing competition, poor execution, navigating transformation, disruption, and time (Hammerich & Lewis, 2013 : 40-30).

Success in this regard seems contradictory as one of the accredited aspect of crises, it is prone to leading to sophomore and hubris inertia. Crises often erupt as a result of change of leadership, especially if the company or organization is not well accustomed to change. Further, poor strategy in facing competition imply the suboptimal adoption some strategic measures that comes as a result of reluctance and superiority to change, which however portray the preparedness for the appearance of competitors. Poor execution on the other hand leads to crisis when quality, precision standards and time are not met, thus lacking behind the competition and failing to meet the needs of customers. Also, the inability to navigate transformation and the incapacity to comply with volatile environment or meet the changes in consumer needs is prone to business crisis. Another aspect is disruption, which implies that as the origin of crisis, the company or organization cannot progress with its development pace of new technologies and the market, thus can lead to the loss of market share. Time too is another factor that triggers crisis considering the fact that steady performance may seem not overly concerning (Grüner, 2017: 30).

II. CRISIS MANAGEMENT

According to many authors (Fagerli and Johansen 2003: 237), (Fearn-Banks, 2001: 480) (Fearn-Banks, 1996: 2) “Crisis management is strategic planning to prevent and respond during a crisis or negative occurrence, a process that removes some of the risk and uncertainty and allows the organization to be in greater control of its destiny”.

According to Coombs (2014: 5), he defines crisis management as “A set of factors designed to combat crisis and to lessen the actual damage inflicted by” and deals with the ways in which companies handles or act in situations that might cause damage to the organization. This is however seen as a crisis. In this regard, crisis is seen as an occurrence that has the potential to a company, organization or brand not forgetting its stakeholders. It is also agreed that it is of importance to consider communication and preparation likewise fundamentals of crisis management so as to be able to handle a crisis effectively (Bodeklint, Lindhe&Unosson, 2017:2).

Bodeklint, Lindhe, &Unosson, (2017:4) argues that it is important to know the sorts of crisis that faced by an organization, knowing very well that acknowledging the problem helps the organization to have a better understanding of the ways it can manage the crisis (Dilenschneider, 2000: 121). In addition to this, he also outlined a list of nine different types of crisis that can occur within organization, which include; social responsibility gap, product failure, executive misbehavior, corporate misbehavior, poor business result, spokesperson misbehavior and controversy, loss of public support, death of the symbol of a company, and controversial ownership.

III. FUNDAMENTALS FOR CRISES

In line to the aforementioned (Bodeklint, Lindhe, &Unosson, 2017: 4), added that the most regular crisis is that of confidence. This crisis of confidence is prone to occur as a result of any of the above types of crisis and there is an imbalance between the brand values and promises in comparison to what is said and how action taken in the organization. They also argue that the proper way in handling a crisis is through communication and not to try to avoid comments. Another possible way of managing a crisis is to evaluate the crisis by applying three key questions; how severe the crisis is, whether or not customers identify themselves with the brand, are the accusations true (Greyser, 2009: 590-602).

These areas are the fundamental aspects that often affect the crisis. For fear of wide spread of information, explains that it is very important to act quickly whenever a crisis occur, so as to have consistency throughout the process and it is very important to be open as well. Responding quickly is fundamental because information nowadays is spread rapidly and thus this could affect the key stakeholders. It is advisable to be consistent in handling the crisis and information since as it is very crucial for building credibility for the response. Another important aspect is being transparent. Transparency is a foundation for managing crises since it leads to worst responses, which is something that can be prevented by openness, Transparency can help limit surprised claims thus give full illustration of the situation and organization (Coombs, 2014: 5).

There are some factors in crisis management that helps in having a clear view. Preparation is one of such factors. These factors give an overview on how preparations for crisis can be made. Identifying major sectors which might risk having

crises is very important. This is because identifying the major sources to crises in a company or industry helps to better prepare in handling or solving the crises. Through these words, organizations can better prepare for, or even try to avoid any crises. There are four steps use in assessing the urgency of a crisis. These include; estimate the probability of the risk, estimate the negative impact of the risk, multiply the monetary harm with the probability of the risk to get the expected value of the crisis at risk and finally, rank according to value (Augustine, 2000: 8).

This helps in identifying which risks is prone to becoming a crisis. There is also the importance of identifying potential sources for crisis so as to be well prepared cause put forth an argument by these sources to assess the seriousness of the situation and identifying the consequences that may occur for a company is very important (Bodeklint, Lindhe & Unosson, 2017:6).

IV. PREPARATION

Preparing for a crisis does not only requires the identification of the potential crisis but it also tries to avoid the risks that are prone to be avoided. In answering question “what can we do to avoid or make this safe as a source of future problems?” it is seen that there is different cost attached to different precautions.

Being cautious on decisions and actions that are carried out within a company helps in avoiding potential crises. In connection to this statement, the first step to a good crisis management is preparation, even though this process sometimes skips due to “crises are accepted by many onlookers as an unavoidable condition of everyday existence.” The fundamental of preparation is to identify potential risks that is susceptible to causing crisis. (Greyser, 2009: 590-602) believes that making contingency plans are great preparations that could be beneficial to companies, likewise establishing crisis center and determining who is included in the crisis team, creating a pre-set communication and making sure they are functioning. Working with communication helps in preventing crises.

A powerful tool to prevent crisis is the use of a corporate culture that is more of people go to and none profit-centered. A good example to explain this statement is a CEO (A chief executive officer) who hardly listen to the complaints of co-workers or consumers. Their attitude might be the main cause of a crisis. Media also plays a role in crisis. Understanding the role of media helps, since as in many cases the media gives the public what media wants to know and not really what they need to know. All these because of business strategies and to win rating wars (Luecke, 2004: 24).

V. COMMUNICATION

Communication is one of the factors of crisis management. Communication and the use of media policy are a great tool in crisis management, as these tools suppress rumors and gives facts that can control the way in which the organization is perceived on media. Having a plan like a media policy is another great way of being prepared (Coombs, 2014: 7). It is vital that they should be an inclusion of who to handle the media, and what exactly to be said (Bodeklint, Lindhe & Unosson, 2017: 6). An effective communication includes quick, up-to-date, and truthful.

According to Fearn-Banks, a crisis communication plan (media policy) should incorporate the following; policies, purposes, goals and assigned duties to accomplish a great communication that works flows quickly in case of predictions that crisis will occur. The careful selection of employees to handle media issues is very important according to Fearn-Banks, as these persons represents or is seen as the company in the eyes of the public.

VI. SITUATION CRISIS COMMUNICATION THEORY

The situational Crisis Communication Theory or “the symbolic approach to CM/communication” (Coombs 1995: 447; 1998: 177) is a model which is developed by W.T. Coombs with the aim at building a tool for crisis managers to better understand to crisis (Heath and Coombs, 2006: 203-207). It is obvious that crisis is in different categories, but this simple and effective tool can be a great start to determine the best approach to follow. The very first thing to do is to express concern for the victims, based in mind that “this is expected by stakeholders and recommended by crisis experts but is not admission of guilt”. When this is done, the “crisis managers must begin their efforts by using communication to address the physical and psychological concerns of the victims”. The people concern depends on the “frame” of the crisis. In every decision, there is the influence of customer’s evaluation of the crisis by framing effect, which however shows that the context leading to the crisis’ outbreak changes its consequences (Malgieri, 2016: 101). There are three possible frames (Coombs, 2006: 163-176):

The victim: The company itself is a victim in this cluster. The probability of this happening is when there is mutual disaster, the circulation or false rumors about the company, and acts of violence that are particularly perpetuated by the employees of the company who acts on their own accord. The company's reputation is faced with mild threat and the public's reaction is likely to be sympathetic.

The incident: Crisis of such scenario is derived from the company's misbehavior which is aiding to be unconditional. This can be caused by the failure of equipment and machinery that causes an industrial accident, likewise a product to be recalled. Comparing this cluster with the previous one, it can be seen that the reputation impact is higher in this cluster. The company is bound to assure the public that it has not powers to prevent the event.

The intentional crisis: Actions here depending on a deliberated choice or act of the company. An example of this could be, false claims that cause damage to things and people, violations of laws and regulations, or better still avoidable errors. This frame poses one of the greatest risks to the reputation of the company.

Malgieri (2016: 101), argues that there are two more factors that influences crisis outcome, which include history of similar antecedent crisis and the relationship that exist with customers. There are three different strategies to manage crisis communication. Each of the strategy is tailored to suit each of the previously mentioned crisis frame in order to create a counter-frame. The main target in this scenario is the company's vision of the story. Looking at the strategies, the first one of them is "deny"; This strategy is suited for the crisis in which the company is equally a victim and the main aim is to deny the company's responsibilities within the event. The second strategy is "diminishing"; this strategy was suggested by Coombs so that it could be applied whenever the crisis is the result of an incident. The main purpose here is to frame the incident to a lesser event, with the company holding minimum or better still no responsibilities. Lastly, "rebuilding" is the last strategy; this happens when the crisis is perceived to be the fault of the company and what is done at this stage is to take full responsibility and try to rebuild the relationship. In order to do so, there must be the repairing at the caused harm and eliciting memories of previous positive company's behaviors, and also to try to counter-balance the ill effects of the crisis (Malgieri, 2016: 101).

From the aforementioned, it is very important to note that remaining coherent with the chosen strategy is an obligation. This is because changing it from the beginning will make the customers and public to doubt about the real crisis' motive, extent and responsibilities, aggravating the reputation damage. It should also be taken into account that the perception of emerging from the news and online media will be "the final arbitrator of the crisis frame", which is an indication that regardless of the strategy of the company, the decision about the attribution of the responsibilities and the consequential reputation damage will depend solely to the opinion of the public.

VII. BRAND REPUTATION

Brand reputation is fast becoming a very important topic. At first, it was more related to crisis management and public relations, where managers acted and worked on the reputation only when it was necessary. Today, brand reputation is crucial and is managed strategically with a long-term mindset (Aaker, 2014: 106). To make a brand be profitable and prosperous, it should be credible and have a positive reputation. For this reputation to be evolve for a brand, there is a need of a long-term perspective in thinking. Having and showing good reputation requires a lot of hard work. There is always a high increase probability for companies to have satisfied customers if they obtain a strong reputation over a long time (fombrun and Shanley, 1990: 233-269).

If the company fails to do its promises or deliver the best to its customers, the reputation will drastically decrease. Brand reputation comes into a setting based on how communication and brand image are distributed to the citizens by the corporation. The actions of a company play a great role to consumers, reasons being that most consumer have the tendency to value the quality of a brand through its previous actions and its presence on the market. The positive views of consumers are based on the credibility of the company. Another important aspect is trust. Trust builds a company reputation especially through the expectations of the brand and product that the company is expected to meet so as to be very reliable in the eyes of the customers (Bodeklint, Lindhe & Unosson, 2017: 9).

According to Ngwese (2007: 29), brands are expected to develop a positive reputation so as to be successful and be profitable. Brand names are seen to be repositories for firm's reputation, given that the performance of high-quality on one product can be transferred to another product through brand name. For brands with high reputation, its ultimate goal is to make and keep strengthening its image or to examining the key traits that the consumers attribute to the brand. In

understanding the meaning of Brand, Keller and Fill put forth that, a brand is either a combination of a name, team, design, logo or sign. A brand has the purpose to identify services and products from a seller and tries to differentiate it from other competitors (Bodeklint, Lindhe & Unosson, 2017: 8).

A brand is much more than just looking at what a company offers to make a differentiation. There are many assumptions as to understanding the exact definition of a brand. For instance, some scholars look brand in the following; brands add value, brand as a risk reducer and brand as a personality. Brand helps stakeholders to be able to identify the position of a company. A brand creates a lot of awareness and has so much increased reputation in a market. It is quite possible that a product be easily duplicated and produced by other competitors, but with the help of a brand, it makes it exclusive and difficult for other competitors to copy. Also, the names of a brand and also logos help consumers to be able to find products they want, and to also know the quality and features to expect from the brand, each time they purchase the same brand. In other words, a brand is a concept of giving meaning to a product and creating awareness for the consumers. Branding is the process to make sure consumers are aware and used to the company and to make sure this remains in consumer's mind. The main ambition of branding is to receive loyal customers by delivering products that meets the expectation and objective/promises of the brand (Bodeklint, Lindhe & Unosson, 2017: 8).

VIII. SOCIAL MEDIA

Having an idea on the meaning of social media is very important in understanding how media platforms are all about. Halligan and Shan define media as "Internet-based tools for sharing and discussing information among human beings" (Zondi, 2014: 10). Scott also regards social media as media where citizens have the possibilities to share thoughts and opinions online. According to Agichtein, Castillo, Donato, Gionis, and Mishne (2008: 183) social media is "popular user-generated content domains [that] include blogs and Web forums, social bookmarking sites, photo and video sharing communities, as well as social networking platforms such as Facebook and MySpace, which offer a combination of all of these with an emphasis on the relationships among the users of the community".

It is of interest to note that social media is quite different from the so-called mainstream media, based on the fact that everyone is free to create, comments on, and even add to social media content. The range of social media is really huge and do includes; social networking like Facebook and Myspace, Wikis (Webpages for collaboration), video-and photo-sharing (YouTube, Flickr), blogs (personal online diaries), online reviews (Yelp), Social bookmarking (Delicious), and virtual world (second life, world of war craft).

Private social networking platforms

Private social networks are referred to those social platforms that have standardized two-way friending. It is a site where the connection must be accepted by both parties. Apart from the common and dominance of Facebook and LinkedIn today, there have also been site very fragmented vertical sites.

Private social networking platforms include;

- **Friendster:** It was launched in 2002 and was once the hottest thing in social networking. It became dead in the U.S. by 2006. It was again acquired in 2009, having about 115 million members, with the vast majority in Asian countries (Kinyens & Wertz, 2016: 23).
- **MySpace:** It was launched in 2003, hit over 100 million accounts to become the most popular network site in the world (Kinyens & Wertz, 2016: 23).
- **Bebo:** It was launched in 2005. It had over 40 million users, and more than 1 billion pages' viewers per week just within 2008. About 30 – 40 % of this site's users were from the United Kingdom (Kinyens & Wertz, 2016: 23).
- **Orkut:** It was launched in 2004 and became Google's first foray in social media. It had the most traction in India and Brazil. By 2008, it became one of the most visited websites in those two countries. By 2014, the site was closed by Google.

By 2009, Facebook became the leading social networking site, just five years after its creation and launched its Harvard-only version (thefacebook.com). Since this period, it has emerged to be the number category leader. Early competitors like Bebo and MySpace became inconsequential. This is the same case with other international competitors like StudiVZ in Germany.

Public social media

Public social networks refer to social platforms that have an asymmetric follow model. It is a site where people can follow someone else without them necessarily follow you back. In most of these sites, one can view someone's content on the platform without even logging onto the service. Good examples include; Twitter, Vine, YouTube, Instagram and Wattpad.

The internet and the digital disruption, changed, so did the media mix, thus giving marketers new tools like; blogs, websites, forums. etc to better communicate. This new era of new discovery (internet and computers) changed the concept of media communication. Today, the most important tool for communication is most probably the social media (Malgieri, 2016: 51). Social media do have multiple roles in the digital marketing process, which helps in getting more insight about the demands of customers, creates customer's needs and the most delivery tool in the digital world, especially in building strong digital brands. There are several digital medias, which are either; paid, earned and owned.

Social media a platform found from the internet that helps users to communication and share experiences. The work load of the information on social media is so huge such that these platforms filter the information that users get. The tools are simple and easy for every user to use, and the hashtag-function is implemented also to enable people mark their post or images to be in certain category. Facebook and Instagram are seen to be the social media platforms that lots of people engage into, especially the youths. Twitter as well, is widely use but mostly for elderly generation. There is a common attribute to all these platforms to social media which is; commenting, liking, sharing content or reacting to other posts. This study does not focus on all social medias. It eliminates platforms like video sharing platforms like YouTube, networking platform like Google+, and quick message application like Snapchat.

How did Facebook win as the leading social networking site?

Having a huge daily use case is the key to Facebook's success. As soon as Facebook launched its Newsfeed, it shifted its foal of social networking from just maintaining one's own profile (Ilike the case of MySpace) to following that what the people you love and care for are doing. Facebook has turn out to be a morning ritual for many people, just the same case as reading newspaper. This practice is repeated throughout the day so long as fresh contents continues to stream in. The daily use case of Facebook is driven by two main key factors:

- **The depth of the relationships of the members on the platform:** It is impossible to log in everyday if you don't care or love the people on the platform. The two-way friend request is a great assurance that users probably have an existing relationship or are interested in creating one and stay connected.
- **Relevance of the content:** The previous point greatly influences this. For instance, people care what their friends, family and other connections are doing, sharing and reading. That is why they decide to log in to Facebook to have a glance.

It shouldn't be surprising that as Facebook has undisputedly become the category leader among private social networks, LinkedIn on the other hand can be considered as the category leader in professional social networking.

IX. FACEBOOK

Facebook is a social media tool that was founded in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg, having a unique site compare to other social networking sites. Facebook is a collection of sites, with each site focusing on one of 2000 individual colleges (Gilpin, 2010: 265-287). From the origin, this site was focused only around universities. Users of the site had to use @college.edu email address to be able to sign up for a particular college account, with their privileges on the site being limited to browsing the profiles of students of that college (Eriksson & Olsson, 2016: 198-208). As time went on, Facebook became a fixture at campuses across the entire nation, thus making Facebook to evolve from a hobby to a full-time job for Zuckerberg and his friends.

By May 2005, Facebook received about \$13 million dollars in venture funding, and from that moment the site started selling targeted adverts to users of its site, likewise it partners with other firms like; Apple and JetBlue so as to assist in marketing their products to college students (Vistbacka, 2017: 16)

According to Ryan, Facebook was initially design for Harvard University students, but the popularity of the site grew wider within a year. Creators of the site implemented some network features so as to retain the exclusiveness of the site. This feature was only allowed for members to join if their school had an existing network on the site. Sign up with official

email address from their schools was required. In cases of no official email address, membership in the network had to be approved by an administrator before any further access into the site. Facebook users found themselves as members of an effective part of an exclusive virtual social club, where they could easily interact and locate with other users from within their offline social networks like old and new school friends. It was then easy for them to share personal contents among the people within the circle of networks and feel confident about the safety and privacy outside of their networks (Ryan, 2015: 67).

As the popularity of Facebook rapidly grew, many changes were taking place to improve the network structure so as to enable more people from outside the United States to join. By October 2005, North America university students were enabled access to the network, while in May 2006, employees of large corporations were able to join as well. On September 2006, Facebook was accessible to anyone over the age of 13. This social network (Facebook) moved away from its initial organization of just a segregated and exclusive network, to become a global open network, with its features not viable as before. From the 2013 Facebook statistics, it shows that there were 198 million monthly active users of Facebook just within USA and Canada, 2772 million within Europe, 339 million within Asia, and 346 million within the rest of the world. how wide this social network is being used globally (Ryan, 2015: 68).

As a result of the ubiquity and popularity of Facebook, detail descriptions of the features are provided. Facebook users as of now can easily upload and share content to their Timeline. The Timeline is a personal profile page which presents a collected digital life history featuring the shared content of users. According to Facebook, the Timeline is a place where users share and highlight memorable posts, photos and other life events. Some of the common contents share on Timeline are; videos, photos, interesting web-links, comment post, status updates and checking at locations deem interesting. Other users of Facebook publicly acknowledge content that is posted on other users' Timeline, by clicking the Like button or link, and they can as well contribute their thoughts and feedback by simply leaving a "comment" (Ryan, 2015: 69).

Another main feature of Facebook is the 'News Feed', which is so much personalized, and act as a real-time and aggregated stream of content and information. Information on the News Feed is curate by the users themselves. So, the content that are posted by the user's Facebook friends in included, so long as they are post related to their favorite businesses, celebrities, movies, products, artists, hobbies etc. Real-time updates of the News Feed essentially provide a constant update stream of information. There are many other activities that Facebook users can perform on the site. For example, Facebook users can interact with other users by posting public messages or content on the Timeline of other friends, fan pages or business pages. Private messages can also be sent to individuals through the Message or Chat applications. Users also have the possibilities of playing Games by themselves or with others on the site, or preferably join Groups to view information or make new friends, likewise create invitations for real world occasions through the use of Events.

X. CAMBRIDGE ANALYTICA

In the period of 2013, there was the creation of an application call "this is your digital life" by a Cambridge psychology professor named Dr. Aleksandr Kogan. The main purpose for this app was to provide Facebook users with a personality quiz. After downloading this app by a Facebook user, it will start collecting all personal information of that person, such as all Facebook activity and profile information. It is believed that about 300,000 people downloaded the app. The collection of data didn't end there since the app also collected information of "friends-of-friends" whose private setting were set to allow it. It is estimated that the app collected about 87 million people's data (Kozłowska, 2018: 2).

Dr. Kogan later passed this data on to a Strategic Communication Laboratories (SCL), which is the owner of Cambridge Analytica (CA) (a political consulting firm that uses data to determine voter personality behavior and traits). This data is then use help facilitate conservative campaigns in targeting online messaging and advertisements. Dr. Kogan violated Facebook terms of service by transferring this data to other third parties like CA, which prohibit the transfer of any data to another ad network, data broker or other services related to monetization or advertising.

When the information got to Facebook in 2015, the app of Kogan was removed and he was asked to provide a certificate together with CA. They had deleted the data from Facebook. Both Kogan and CA certified to Facebook that they destroyed the data. It is unfortunate that the data remained beyond Facebook's control. Facebook failed to make a public statement regarding the incident nor did it tell the users about their data being shared with CA. Facebook did not also

report the incident to the Federal Trade Commission nor the US agency that oversees privacy-related issues. The CEO of Facebook, Mark Zuckerberg, in his two days congressional hearing on the 9th and 10th of April, said once they receive CA's attestation to prove that the data has been deleted and no longer in use, Facebook will then consider the case closed (Kozłowska, 2018: 3).

By March 17, 2018 in the Guardian and the New York Times, the news about the data collection by Kogan broke out. Facebook then became aware that the data had not been purged until this day. This incident after falling out became unprecedented. Facebook started having several lawsuits, governmental inquiries from US, EU, and UK, a sharp drop in its share price that erased approximately \$50 billion of the company's market capitalization and a #DeleteFacebook boycott campaign just within 3 days that the news broke out. However, the Cambridge Analytica incident involves the most serious mishandling and misuse of consumer data. A prominent Republican donor, Robert Mercer and Stephen Bannon, who are both Trump's former political advisers says that CA was using the data of people for explicit political purposes, so as to help the conservative campaigns of 2016 American presidential elections, including Donald Trump's campaign. The 3000,000 Facebook users who downloaded the app nor their 87 million friends anticipated about their personal data to be used for political purposes.

According to Hanna (2010), he argues that the released information that Facebook gave unfettered and unauthorized access to about 87 million people's personal information of Facebook users to a data firm called Cambridge Analytica fueled rising interest in the debate on the societal impact of technology and the risks to citizens' well-being and privacy.

Cudmore and James True (2018:1) argue that the Facebook data incident started with a kind of simple personality test on Facebook. It started with questions like; What is your luckiest day? What color is your dog's aura? Etc and all these questions seemed legit. What is surprising is that the motives behind the academic conduction of the test were not intended. Kogan collected the data with the aim of selling them to Cambridge Analytica which was engaged by the Trump and Brexit campaigns to create targeted ads online. Cambridge Analytica used the collected data to create "psychographic profiles" of the users depending on the personality measures of how open they were, extroversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism and agreeableness.

The way the whole show worked is that the personality test results helped in having access to the users' profiles, and the profiles were matched against the things the users "liked" on Facebook. A correlation was then applied to the "likes" of all those who downloaded the app plus their friends so as to be able to predict their personality traits. For instance, someone who "likes" Person A is probably high on openness but somehow low on neuroticism. Ads were targeted to users of Facebook based on their profiles, and in cases where the individual was assessed to be neurotic, he/she would see an ad depicting a home invasion (Cudmore and True, 2018:1).

Researchers also argue that the numerous users who downloaded the app only agreed that their data will be used just for academic purposes, and not to target political campaign ads. The privacy law which is used globally says that one can only use data for the purpose for which he/she gets consent at the time of collection. Contrary to this is a violation of law.

The users at this instance had no consent at all, regarding the collection of their personal information for other purposes other than what they had in mind. The worst scenario is that the users had no idea that their personal information was collected. Facebook often shares user data with third parties, but its data policy states the purpose for which the data will be used for. In its privacy policy, Facebook makes it clear that data can be shared with a third party only for the purpose of conducting academic research and surveys. Anything political like campaigns are not part of its policy. This however shows that Cambridge Analytica breached Facebook's terms. In respect to this, Mark Zuckerberg (CEO of Facebook), released a statement saying that "we have a responsibility to protect your data, and if we can't then we don't deserve to serve you". The speech continued "This was a breach of trust between Kogan, Cambridge Analytica and Facebook" (Cudmore and True, 2018: 2). Facebook points out its defenses to be: users involved in the incident believe their data was for academic purposes; and secondly, Kogan and Cambridge Analytica are the ones who used the data for other purposes, which to Facebook had nothing to do with their company. One key argument here is that when Facebook first heard that the data had been misused, it wrote to Kogan telling him to delete everything. He didn't do that, and Facebook failed to follow up on the issue. Was that reasonable? The tendency now is that Facebook employees worked in Trump's campaign office alongside Cambridge Analytica.

XI. CONCLUSION

The finding in this study reveals that once a brand has succeeded in gaining a positive reputation from its customers, it can be denoted as trustworthy, thus giving a positive image of the brand. That aspect attracts more customers to pursuing the brand and also increase the number of loyal customers. The higher the number of loyal customers a brand reputation attracts, the higher the market value of the brand equity will be. From the results, it shows that collateral information collection poses some sort of privacy issues for Facebook users and other social media users. In this case, a vast majority of participants are very concerned about their personal information and wish for proper notification and control mechanisms in regard to collateral information collection. Despite the fact that Facebook is a helpful tool for many users, it also shows that some users do develop disordered used of Facebook. For instance, some individuals use Facebook to escape from negative moods, lose control over their Facebook use, experience preoccupation with Facebook, use Facebook excessively and also feel withdrawal whenever they don't use Facebook.

REFERENCES

- [1] Augustine, N. (2000). Harvard business review on crisis management. 1st ed. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [2] Bodeklint K., Lindhe A., & Unosson W. (2017). "Crisis Management & Brand Reputation". An exploratory study on crisis management and its effects on brand reputation, <http://www.diva-portal.se/smash/get/diva2:1103637/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- [3] Bodeklint, K., Lindhe, A. and Unosson, W. (2017) 'An exploratory study on crisis management and its effects on brand reputation', (May), p. 9.
- [4] Coombs, W. (2014). "Ongoing crisis communication". 1st ed. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- [5] Coombs, W. T. (1995). "Choosing the right words: The development of guidelines for the selection of the "appropriate" crisis response strategies". *Management Communication Quarterly*, 8: 447-476.
- [6] Coombs, W., and Holladay, S. (2006), "Unpacking the Halo Effect: Reputation and Crisis Management", *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 123-137.
- [7] Cuudmore & True (2018). "How Cambridge Analytica (And Facebook?) Breached All The Privacy Laws".
- [8] Dilenschneider, Robert L. (2000). *The Corporate Communications Bible: Everything You Need to Know to Become a Public Relations Expert*. Beverly Hills: New Millennium Press.
- [9] Fagerli, Hans P., and Bjørn R. J. (2003). "Crisis Management". In *Corporate Communication: A Strategic Approach to Building Reputation*, edited by Peggy Simcic Brønn and Roberta Wiig. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- [10] Fearn-Banks, K. (1996). *Crisis Communications : A Casebook Approach*. Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- [11] Fearn-Banks, K. (2001). "Crisis Communication: A Review of Some Best Practices". Inc.
- [12] Fombrun, C., and Shanley, M. (1990) 'What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy', *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(2), 233–269.
- [13] Gilpin, D. (2010). Organizational image construction in a fragmented online me media environment. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22(3), 265-287.
- [14] Greysen, S. (2009). Corporate brand reputation and brand crisis management. *Management Decision*, 47(4), pp.590-602.
- [15] Grüner A. K. (2017). "Influence of sudden incidents on the Brand Reputation of a firm and its Reaction". Fundação Getulio Vargas Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo. https://bibliotecadigital.fgv.br/dspace/bitstream/handle/10438/19117/Ann-Kathrin%20Gr%C3%BCner_Master%20Thesis%20MPGI_2017.pdf.
- [16] Hammerich, K., & Lewis, R. D. (2013). Eight types of corporate crisis and the role of national culture. *MWorld: Journal of the American Management Association*, Fall, pp. 40-43.

- [17] Heath, Robert L., and Coombs W. T. (2006). *Today's Public Relations: An Introduction*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- [18] Institute for Crisis Management (ICM). (2016). "ICM Annual Crisis Report: News coverage of business crises in 2015". Denver, CO: Institute for Crisis Management. Retrieved from Crisis Consultant.
- [19] Kingyens A. T., & Wertz B. (2016). "Understanding Social Platforms". Versionone, <https://versionone.vc/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Understanding-Social-Platforms-Dec2016.pdf>.
- [20] Kozłowska, I. (2018). "Facebook and Data Privacy in the Age of Cambridge Analytica". The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, <https://jsis.washington.edu/news/facebook-data-privacy-age-cambridge-analytica/>.
- [21] Luecke, R. (2004). *Crisis management*. 1st ed. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [22] Malgieri F. (2016). "Social Media and Brand Crisis." LUISS, Department of Business and Management, chair of digital marketing.
- [23] Mitroff, I. I., and Anagnos G. (2001). *Managing Crisis Before They Happen: What Every Executive and Manager Needs to Know About Crisis Management*. New York: Amacom.
- [24] Regester, M., and Judy L. (2005). *Risk issues and crisis management: A casebook of best practice*. London: Kogan Page. 3rd. ed.
- [25] Ryan, T. (2015). "Facebook Addiction: An Exploratory Study Using Mixed Methods", Master Thesis, Rmit University, Australia.
- [26] Vistbacka S. (2017). *Crisis Management in Social Media – Maintaining the Organizational Image*.
- [27] Zondi T. (2014). *Social media and its Contribution to Brand Building with special reference to Generation Y*.