

USING SOCIAL MEDIA TO ADDRESS PREVENTABLE CRISES:

FOCUS GROUPS WITH MOMS

by

MAIKO NAKAI

A THESIS

Presented to the School of Journalism and Communication
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts

September 2012

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Maiko Nakai

Title: Using Social Media to Address Preventable Crises: Focus Groups with Moms

This thesis has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in the School of Journalism and Communication by:

Tiffany Derville Gallicano Chairperson

Pat Curtin Member

Harsha Gangadharbatla Member

and

Kimberly Andrews Espy Vice President for Research & Innovation/Dean of the
Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded September 2012

© 2012 Maiko Nakai

THESIS ABSTRACT

Maiko Nakai

Master of Arts

School of Journalism and Communication

September 2012

Title: Using Social Media to Address Preventable Crises: Focus Groups with Moms

This study examines how an organization can use social media to solve preventable crises. Focus groups with a total of 14 moms are conducted to discuss a controversial Motrin babywearing advertisement and how Johnson & Johnson should have responded to the social media backlash. The results are explored based on dialogic public relations theory and its five components. Additional insights regarding the use of different social media channels and culture jamming YouTube videos suggest theoretical and practical implications on organizational responses on social media during preventable crises. The study also explores how people with high- and low-context cultures might respond differently to offensive advertising.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Maiko Nakai

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene
Osaka Jogakuin College, Osaka, Japan

DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Arts, Communication and Society, 2012, University of Oregon
Bachelor of Arts, Journalism, 2008, University of Oregon
Associate in Arts, English, 2005, Osaka Jogakuin College

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Public Relations
 Social Media, Global Communications
Marketing
 International Marketing, Branding
Human Resources
 Internal Communications, Employee Relations, Recruiting
Management
 Business Ethics and Leadership, Employee Training

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Web Content Developer / Reporters' Assistant / Project Manager, Asahi
Newspaper
 Company, Osaka, Japan, 2003-present during school breaks

Graduate Teaching Fellow, Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures,
 University of Oregon, Eugene, 2010-2012

PR Intern, Fleishman-Hillard, San Francisco, 2011

Communication Liaison / Program Coordinator, Office of International Affairs,
 University of Oregon, Eugene, 2008-2009

Writer, Junglecity Network, Portland, 2009

PR / Media Marketing Assistant, American Cancer Society, Eugene, 2008

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Graduate Teaching Fellowship, Japanese, University of Oregon, 2010-2012

Magna Cum Laude, University of Oregon, 2008

The National Scholars Honor Society, 2008

Who's Who Among Students in American Universities and Colleges, 2008

Harpham Award for the Best Paper by an International Student, University of Oregon, 2007 and 2008

Dean's Award for Service, University of Oregon, 2007

Campus Leadership and International Involvement Award, University of Oregon, 2007

Dean's List, University of Oregon, 2005-2009

Academic Excellence Award, University of Oregon, 2005

1st place in an English Presentation Contest, Osaka Jogakuin College, 2005

2nd Place in an English Speech Contest, 2005

PUBLICATIONS:

Nakai, M. (2010). *A Conversation with Andrew Ervin*. Coffee House Press.
<http://www.coffeehousepress.org/blog-posts/a-conversation-with-andrew-ervin/>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank those people who helped me get here. First, my deepest gratitude goes out to my wonderful advisor, Dr. Tiffany Derville Gallicano, for her patience, input, encouragement, and all the time we spent together every week to go over my work and discuss the next steps. I also thank her for being personable and as a mentor and person, supporting me through the hardship I've experienced during the past year. I don't know how much her energy and positive thinking pushed my back. I appreciate my committee members, Dr. Pat Curtin and Dr. Harsha Gangadharbatla, as well for their feedback, expertise in social media and qualitative study, and support throughout this whole process and my two years in graduate school. I got the best team.

I'm grateful to have so many wonderful friends in town and back in my home country, Japan. I especially thank my colleagues in my master's program for their support, check-ins, smiles, hugs, and "likes" and comments on Facebook. Since my family is across the Pacific Ocean, their presence is even big for me. My friends are my family.

Many thanks to Jon and Esther Driscoll, and their sons, Jed and Bryant, who allowed me to be part of their family and gave me unconditional love and support at both my highest and lowest points. They provided me with a safe and comfortable house and warm hearts. Without them, I wouldn't have been able to complete my study. Finally, I'm thankful for my parents, Koichi and Tomoko, and my sister, Naoko, who had my cute niece, Yua, last year. Although they were far away, I knew they were always caring about me and sending their best wishes and love. I can't thank them enough for everything in the last 27 years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Crisis and Moms' Responses.....	4
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
Situational Crisis Communication Theory.....	7
Assessment of a Reputational Threat.....	8
Social Media	9
Dialogic Public Relations Theory.....	10
Crisis Communication with Social Media	12
Twitter in Crisis Communication.....	14
Audiences' Use of Twitter	14
Organizations' Use of Twitter	16
Facebook in Crisis Communication.....	17
Audiences' Use of Facebook	17
Organizations' Use of Facebook.....	18
Blogs in Crisis Communication	19
YouTube in Crisis Communication	21
III. METHOD	23
Case Selection.....	24
Recruitment.....	24
Focus Group Procedure.....	25

Chapter	Page
Data Analysis	27
Reflexivity and Reactivity	28
IV. RESULTS	30
General Response to the Ad.....	30
RQ1: How Does Dialogic Public Relations Theory Inform Desired Responses to a Preventable Crisis If at All?	32
RQ2: How Should an Organization Respond to Culture Jamming During a Preventable Crisis?.....	42
RQ3: What Additional Insights Can Be Learned About Social Media Use During a Preventable Crisis?.....	43
V. DISCUSSION	45
Theoretical Reinforcement.....	48
Practical Recommendations.....	49
Limitations	51
Future Research	51
APPENDICES	53
A. AMY GATES' EMAIL TO MOTRIN AND RESPONSE FROM MOTRIN.....	53
B. RECRUITMENT EMAIL.....	54
C. RECRUITMENT ON FACEBOOK STATUS.....	55
D. RECRUITMENT VIA FACEBOOK MESSAGE.....	56
E. INFORMED CONSENT EMAIL	57
F. FOCUS GROUP MODERATOR GUIDE.....	59
G. TRANSCRIPT OF MOTRIN AD	63

Chapter	Page
H. MCNEIL / JOHNSON & JOHNSON’S APOLOGY LETTER ON WEBSITE	64
I. PARENT BLOG POST WITH SAMPLE COMMENTS	65
J. CULTURE JAMMING YOUTUBE VIDEO RESPONSE TO MOTRIN AD	70
K. TWEETS FEATURED ON VIDEO	71
L. OUTRAGED MOM YOUTUBE VIDEO RESPONSE.....	72
M. “BABYWEARING ISN’T PAINFUL. BOYCOTT MOTRIN FOR SAYING IT IS.”	73
N. FOCUS GROUP TRANSCRIPTIONS	74
Group 1	74
Group 2	94
Group 3	113
REFERENCES CITED.....	135

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Communication with stakeholders during a crisis affects an organization's reputation and future. It is crucial to integrate Web strategies into an organization's crisis communication plan because presenting no response online can be interpreted as "no comment," which is a poor crisis response strategy (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). Furthermore, during crises the public expects an organization to provide quick, accurate responses, especially in the Web 2.0 world (Coombs & Holladay, 2010; Wigley & Fontenot, 2011). A challenge with using social media during crises is that there is a risk that the pressure for speed can result in accuracy errors (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). However, social media, such as Twitter, Facebook, and blogs, seem especially effective in communication for their interactive and timely nature, as well as their broad reach (Coombs & Holladay, 2010; Schultz, Utz & Göritz, 2011).

For example, Twitter identified a tweet by Ann Curry of the Today show after the Haiti earthquake as the "Most Influential Tweet of 2010" (Today, 2010). Curry tweeted: "@usairforce find a way to let Doctors without Borders planes land in Haiti: <http://bit.ly/8hYZOK> THE most effective at this." Up until then, the United States Air Force was not letting planes carrying doctors and medical supplies land, but people were desperate. Curry's tweet helped the U.S. military give certain planes clearance to land and let physicians save injured and dying civilians.

One reason why social media is especially conducive as a tool for relationship building is because of the ability to use it to interact with publics and engage in dialogue (Kelleher, 2009; Terilli & Arnorsdottir, 2008; Yang & Lim, 2009). Dialogic theory is

helpful for understanding the characteristics of effective dialogue; however, no published studies have explored it in the context of crisis communication through social media.

Given the exploratory nature of this investigation, this study is a qualitative inquiry into how dialogic theory can be insightful for an organization's social media response to a crisis. To obtain depth, this study is delimited to examining preventable crises, which is a type of crisis cluster from Coombs' situational crisis communication theory (SCCT). The preventable cluster refers to human-error accidents, human-error product harm, and organizational misdeed (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). The public attributes the strongest amount of responsibility to organizations in the preventable cluster, as compared with other clusters. When this happens, stakeholders will become angrier, more reluctant to purchase, and more motivated to engage in negative word-of-mouth, which endangers the organization's reputation. Crises in the preventable cluster can be very different from crises in the accidental cluster or victim cluster, and it is important to capture nuances in the grounded context of one crisis scenario.

The case in this study is a babywearing ad campaign Motrin ran in 2008. This is a good case because of the variety of social media that angry moms used to express their discontent. Focus groups of moms who use social media were conducted because they provide the opportunity "to observe a large amount of interaction on a topic in a limited period of time" (Morgan, 1997, p. 8). This study is significant because it focuses on moms' views, which is an important contribution because few studies could be found that explore the use of social media during crises from a defined audience's perspective. Examining the perspective of a defined audience can result in recommendations that are unique to the audience. Several studies in crisis communication are based on a college

student population (e.g., Coombs & Holladay, 2001, 2008; Fussell Sisco, 2012), and this study is important by providing crisis managers with the perspectives of a non-student group. Moms are an important group to study because they have significant influence with making family decisions, especially when it comes to purchasing (Bailey, 2011). According to the Pew Internet Research Center (2011), 65% of adult Internet users are now on social networking sites such as Facebook and LinkedIn, which is up from 61% a year ago. The percentage is twice as much as the percentage reported in 2008. Mommy bloggers have a substantial impact on the online world. Moms are actively sharing their stories about their pregnancy, children, motherhood, and household tips (Taylor, 2009). This evidence suggests that more and more moms are on social media to seek information and connect with people. Consequently, it is important for organizations to use social media to communicate with moms.

Many researchers have examined crisis communications quantitatively (e.g., Arpan & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 2005; Avery, 2010; Coombs & Holladay, 2008, 1996; Dean, 2004; Liu, 2009; Liu, Austin & Jin, 2011; Liu & Kim, 2011; Muralidharan, Rasmussen, Patterson, & Shin, 2011; Oyer, 2010; Schultz, Utz, & Göritz, 2011; Sweetser & Metzgar, 2007). Existing research also tends to discuss social media use during victim cluster crises, such as a natural disaster or school shooting, the latter of which could be classified as a victim cluster to the extent that people believe that the school couldn't prevent it (e.g., Liu & Kim, 2011; Palen, Vieweg, Liu & Hughes, 2009; Rød, Botan & Holen, 2011; Wigley & Fontenot, 2011).

By using qualitative research to investigate the preventable cluster, this study provides new insights about the use of social media during crisis communication. A

qualitative method can result in deep insights into participants' opinions and experiences that are based on complex behaviors and motivations by using open-ended questions (Morgan, 1997). This study examines the intersection of dialogic theory and social media in a preventable cluster. It makes a practical contribution by providing detailed suggestions for an organization's response to its own advertising that has offended a key public.

The Crisis and Moms' Responses

In September 2008, Motrin launched a new advertising campaign online and in magazines that targeted new moms. The ad focused on how wearing a baby in a sling can give them back pain, which can be relieved by Motrin. Many moms were offended by the ad's suggestions that moms wear baby slings because they're fashionable, that they put up with the "good kind of pain" to make them look like "official" moms, and that they look "crazy" (e.g., Gates, 2008; Presnal, 2008).

Immediately, some audience members responded through various social media channels. Within five days, this ad became the most tweeted subject (The New York Times, 2008). Among the first moms to respond was Jessica Gottlieb, who responded to the ad on Twitter with a hashtag, #motrinmoms. This single post ignited a firestorm of criticism on the micro-blogging site from other offended moms, who also used the hashtag. Katja Presnal, a blogger, compiled screenshots of the outraged tweets and photos of moms carrying babies in slings and made a nine-minute YouTube video with the background music of Danny Boy. Consumers posted 16 video responses to YouTube that were identified by using the search term, "Motrin moms commercial." These video

responses attracted a comprehensive total of 696,915 views and 432 comments, although the comment function for most of them is now disabled.

In addition, bloggers called for boycotting Motrin (e.g., Gates, 2008). Two oppositional Facebook fan pages were set up: “Boycott Motrin,” which attracted more than 1,300 people and is no longer accessible online, and “Babywearing isn’t painful. Boycott Motrin for saying it is,” which is still active and has more than 1,063 fans. In addition, numerous blogs addressed the crisis (e.g., Evans, 2008; Learmonth, 2008; Sanders, 2008). While many bloggers agreed that the ad was offensive and Motrin totally “messed up,” there were a few voices that said the ad wasn’t that big of a deal (e.g., OrganicMania, 2008). They thought that Motrin wasn’t too off-base because it is true that carrying a baby gives you pain; Motrin just needed to communicate the message in a different way. There were other moms who thought other moms were over-reacting. To some, what ultimately caused the uproar was the fact that the company just shut down. Motrin took down the ad and temporarily closed its website, but that too was seen as unnecessary by some people (Keane, 2008). They said, instead, Motrin should have opened up the conversation with its audience and invited the upset moms to engage in the conversation about how Johnson & Johnson could fix the problem and do a better job of serving customers in the future.

Kathy Widmer, the vice president of marketing for the McNeil Consumer Healthcare unit of Johnson & Johnson, issued an apology on Motrin’s website. However, consumers and social media influencers didn’t think it was sincere (e.g., Godin, 2008). They said that the language sounded as if it were carefully crafted by a committee or taken from a manual. The company did respond to personal email from bloggers, such as

Amy Gates (see Appendix A for Gates' email and Motrin's response), and sent the same message to many bloggers who shared their displeasure. It also did not respond to the #motrinmoms hashtag to alleviate the backlash, it did not participate in the comments section of the blog posts about the incident, it did not participate in the boycott group on Facebook, nor did it issue a response on its own Twitter feed, YouTube channel, or Facebook fan page. It was found that the small ad agency in New York, Taxi, that created the ad campaign wasn't even aware of the outrage on Twitter and all the fires online (The New York Times, 2008).

Subsequent chapters address public relations and social media as they relate to crisis communication, this study's method, focus group results, and theoretical and practical implications of the study's findings. Specifically, the next chapter discusses the definition of "crisis," one of the dominant crisis communication theories; situational crisis communication theory, which serves as the typology for this study; and the theory this study applies, which is dialogic public relations theory. It also examines how Twitter, Facebook, blogs and YouTube have been used among people and organizations in crisis situations.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A crisis is “a sudden and unexpected event that threatens to disrupt an organization’s operations and poses both a financial and a reputational threat” (Coombs, 2007, p. 164). Reputation is “an aggregate evaluation stakeholders make about how well an organization is meeting stakeholder expectations based on its past behaviors” (Coombs, 2007, p. 164). Crisis management is used to protect an organization’s reputation; the term “crisis management” refers to “a process of preventing, preparing for, performing, and learning from crises” (Coombs, 1999, p. 5). Crisis management prevents or mitigates the damage caused by a crisis and thus helps to protect an organization and its stakeholders. Coombs identified a three-stage approach to crisis management — pre-crisis, crisis event, and post-crisis — as an organizing framework. The pre-crisis stage entails actions that organizational members can take to prevent a crisis, the crisis event deals with the communication during a crisis, and the post-crisis stage includes evaluation and actions for the continued relationship with stakeholders. This study focuses on crisis communication during the crisis event for a particular type of crisis described by the situational crisis communication theory.

Situational Crisis Communication Theory

The situational crisis communication theory (SCCT) can be used to project how stakeholders will respond to a crisis based on the reputational threat a certain type of crisis poses and based on how stakeholders will react to strategies used in crisis communication (Coombs, 2007). SCCT combines the element of rhetorical approaches to

crisis communication with an element of Weiner's (1995) conceptualization of attribution theory, which says that people search for the cause and someone to blame when something negative happens (Coombs & Holladay, 2010; Weiner, 2006). Therefore, it is important to look at how people attribute blame for a crisis.

Assessment of a Reputational Threat

SCCT can be used to assess a reputational threat based on the type of a crisis (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). How a crisis is framed depends on the type of crisis (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). Based on SCCT, there are three groups or "crisis clusters" depending on attributions of crisis responsibility: the victim cluster, accidental cluster, and preventable or intentional cluster (Coombs, 2007). The victim cluster includes natural disaster, rumor, workplace violence, and product tampering or malevolence, all of which are caused by an external agent or force (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). In these cases, the public views the organization as a victim of the crisis (Coombs, 2007). The accidental cluster involves challenges, technical-error accidents, and technical-error product harm in which the organization's action in question is unintentional or uncontrollable by the organization (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). Finally, the preventable cluster, which is the focus of this study, refers to human-error accidents, human-error product harm, and organizational misdeed (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). In these crises, the organization purposely puts people in danger, takes inappropriate actions, or even violates a law or regulation (Coombs, 2007). Misdeeds could occur with or without injuries.

There is a different degree of responsibility for each crisis cluster discussed above. The victim cluster has the weakest attribution of responsibility, and the

preventable cluster has the strongest attribution of responsibility. An experimental study compared the trust scores of a fictitious organization before and after a crisis for all of the cluster types (Oyer, 2010). Despite the researcher's hypothesis that all of the cluster types would report lower trust scores after the crisis as compared with trust scores before the crisis, the results surprisingly indicated higher trust scores after the crisis for the victim cluster. The researcher speculated that this finding could have resulted from respondents' sympathy for the company, although the finding could also be attributed to the fictitious nature of the company in the scenario. As expected, trust scores for the organization were significantly lower in the intentional cluster than they were in the accidental and victim clusters. The more responsibility people attribute to an organization, the more damage the organization's reputation receives, which ultimately lowers people's trust in an organization.

Social Media

The term "social media" refers to "a new era of Web-enabled applications that are built around user-generated or user-manipulated content, such as wikis, blogs, podcasts, and social networking sites" (Pew Internet & American Life, 2010). It is important for organizations to use social media to monitor conversations (especially the negative ones) because issues that emerge online spread more quickly than issues that arise offline (Coombs, 2002, 2008). With social media, people could get overwhelmed by the flood of information, and there is an increased likelihood of spreading incorrect information (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). Nevertheless, the public expects instant and frequent communication with social media, and organizations are increasingly likely to use social media to meet the public's demand, which includes responding to stakeholders' questions

(Coombs & Holladay, 2010). A recent study revealed that public relations practitioners perceived social networks such as Facebook to be the most important communication tool in an organization, followed by micro-blogging sites such as Twitter and video-sharing sites such as YouTube (Wright & Hinson, 2011).

Several public relations studies suggest that organizations need to do a better job of using social media for dialogue, and dialogue is essential for relationship building (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Sweetser & Lariscy, 2008; Taylor, Kent, & White, 2001). Therefore, dialogic theory is important to consider for this study because relationship building is essential for organizations that are in the midst of a crisis (Coombs, 1999).

Dialogic Public Relations Theory

Organizations should use dialogue to cultivate relationships. Dialogue consists of five features: mutuality, propinquity, empathy, risk, and commitment (Kent & Taylor, 2002).

1. **Mutuality.** Mutuality refers to a collaborative approach to communication in which efforts are made to minimize power differentials among participants. In addition, participants using this approach argue for their positions and open mindedly consider each other's views. There are two features of mutuality: collaboration and spirit of mutual equality. Through *collaboration*, an organization advocates for its position while engaging in dialogue to understand the other's position. The *spirit of mutual equality* assures that organizations minimize power differentials and show respect for their publics.

2. **Propinquity.** Dialogic propinquity means that an organization involves publics for decision making, enables publics to communicate their needs, and empowers publics to influence the organization as well. There are three characteristics of propinquity: immediacy of presence, temporal flow, and engagement. *Immediacy of presence* means that an organization involves parties in decision making before decisions are made. *Temporal flow* means that the organization is concerned with its past, current, and future publics by treating them equitably. *Engagement* refers to being accessible and having open, two-way communication.
3. **Empathy.** Empathy indicates the support and trust in a dialogic relationship that enables organizations to put themselves in their stakeholders' shoes. Empathy involves supportiveness, a communal orientation, and confirmation or acknowledgement. *Supportiveness* means that dialogue, not debate, takes place in an accessible manner to facilitate mutual understanding. A *communal orientation* means that an organization focuses on its public relations communication and community building at local and global levels. *Confirmation* refers to acknowledging the other people's voices even when they don't agree with the organization and even when the organization can ignore them.
4. **Risk.** Risk refers to unpredicted or negative consequences that exist in dialogic communication. It is also about the concept of accepting others. Risk has three dimensions: vulnerability, unanticipated consequences, and recognition of strange otherness. *Vulnerability* occurs when organizations

share information about themselves because the information could be used against them. Self-disclosure is conducive to relationship building.

Unanticipated consequences result from the unpredictable and spontaneous nature of dialogic communication. Scripted responses that can interfere with listening should be avoided. *A recognition of strange otherness* includes the fact that everyone is different and is valued in dialogic exchanges.

5. ***Commitment.*** Commitment describes the authentic interactions that involve a commitment to mutually beneficial conversations and relationships. These are based on the effort to understand the other party's values and interests in interpreting the meaning of dialogue. Commitment has three features: genuineness, commitment to conversation, and commitment to interpretation. *Genuineness* suggests honest and forthright communication between organizations and publics for mutually beneficial solutions. *Commitment to conversation* is also necessary for the relationships where conversations are for the purposes of mutual understanding and not for the exploitation of weaknesses. Lastly, *commitment to interpretation* requires efforts to understand what the other person means, as well as efforts to grasp the diverse positions, beliefs, and values of the other party before evaluating them.

This study is focused on the use of social media during a crisis response and extant research indicates that organizations can use social media to its fullest extent by

engaging publics in dialogue; therefore, this study examines the following research question:

RQ 1: How does dialogic public relations theory inform desired responses to a preventable crisis if at all?

Crisis Communication with Social Media

Organizations use social media to monitor and scan online conversations to detect potential crises, correct misperceptions, and discover other concerns among stakeholders (Wigley & Zhang, 2011). A survey of 251 members of the Public Relations Society of America revealed that public relations practitioners believe that it is important to use social media during crisis communication and planning. In fact, more than 80% of respondents' organizations use social media, although only half of the professionals have incorporated social media into their crisis communication plans. Practitioners find Twitter to be especially important to their public relations work, followed by Facebook, blogs, YouTube, Flickr, and MySpace. The more practitioners rely on social media, the better prepared they think they are for handling crises.

Taylor and Perry (2005) conducted a longitudinal study of organizations' adoption of the Internet when responding to crises. The results indicate that despite their hypothesis that organizations are increasing their use of the Internet during crises, organizations are actually decreasing their use of the Internet during crises. However, the study did show an increase in the use of social media for two-way communication and multimedia communication during crises. The limitation of Taylor and Perry's study is that the researchers did not consider the types of the 92 sampled organizations in their analysis. The type of organization, size, and revenue could have influenced the findings.

For example, nonprofit organizations have adopted blogging at a faster pace than corporations (Jin & Liu, 2010).

Liu and Kim (2011) found through their quantitative content analysis of 13 organizations that organizations disseminate more responses via social media and rely more on traditional media than on social media to address the public's emotions (e.g., feeling alert, anger, contempt/disgust, confusion, fear/anxiety, relief, sadness, shame, and sympathy/compassion). The study, which examined H1N1 flu coverage, also revealed that government organizations in this context most frequently incorporated expressions of sympathy and alert. Alert is shown, for example, by addressing the first H1N1 case in the U.S. and by declaring a pandemic. On the other hand, corporations in the study were most likely to clarify confusion in their responses. In this case, confusion usually was around the rumor that people could be infected with H1N1 through pork or pork-product consumption. Given these results and studies showing that publics seek out social media for emotional support during crises (e.g., Choi & Lin, 2009; Kayne, 2005; Liu & Kim, 2011), organizations could improve their crisis communication by using social media to provide emotional support. Organizations should also use social media because doing so enables the public to repost or retweet organizations' messages, which suggests that organizations' message will reach more audiences than they otherwise would (Muralidharan, Dillistone, & Shin, 2011).

Stakeholders expect an immediate response on an organization's social media channels; failure to do so results in deepening the damage to the organization's reputation and image (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). An example is BP's oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, which started on April 20, 2010. A study observed that there was a delay in

responding to the crisis — BP's first tweet and Flickr photo entries were on April 27, the first Facebook post was made was on May 2, and the first YouTube video was uploaded on May 27 (Muralidharan, Dillistone & Shin, 2011). Critics expected a response within the first hour (e.g., Diana, 2011; Dugan, 2010).

Twitter in Crisis Communication

Audiences' use of Twitter. Ordinary people are using social media to quickly disseminate information and become a source of breaking news (Muralidharan, Dillistone, & Shin, 2011). For example, a man in Pakistan named Sohaib Athar tweeted the scene of the Osama bin Laden raid of the helicopter via his @ReallyVirtual account as it unfolded without even knowing what he was witnessing (Brenhouse, 2011). Twitter users generated numerous Twitter updates before President Obama confirmed bin Laden's death (Smith, 2011). As evidenced here, Twitter is a primary source of information, as well as the center of conversation, for many people. In this case, Twitter also performed many of the functions of traditional news media by directing people to news reports and information sources.

Another example where Twitter shaped the community during a crisis is the Great East Japan Earthquake, a 9.0 magnitude quake centered around Sendai, Japan, on March 11, 2011. During the emergency, those who were stuck in buildings or at train stations announced their situations on Twitter, posted updates on Facebook news feeds, or uploaded videos on YouTube (Ad Age, 2011).

Twitter can be also used against an organization, which happened during the BP oil spill crisis in the Gulf of Mexico. While the actual BP account (with about 13,500 followers), @BP_America, provided updates and links to video clips, an anonymous

operator had fun through a fake account (with more than 150,000 followers), @BPGIbalPR (Heussner, 2010). For instance, it said, "... the ocean is like rootbeer and oil is like ice cream. We just made America a giant rootbeer float!" Another tweet read: "Really worried about the effect this disaster will have on bikini season. The sun is still shining ladies, get outt [*sic*] the [*sic*] there!" BP considered the parody intended to be deceptive or misleading and asked Twitter to request the account holder to abide by the Twitter parody guidelines (Twitter Help Center, 2012). Twitter told the holder to identify that the account was fake or it would be suspended.

The fake BP Twitter account is an example of culture jamming, which is relevant to this study because people engaged in culture jamming in response to the Motrin ad. *Culture jamming* is a form of rhetorical protest that undermines an organization's communications through such practices as media hoaxes and corporate sabotage (Harold, 2004). Through culture jamming, media activism occurs through a playful rhetorical approach. Culture jamming is often comedic but not in a satirical sense. As appropriation (e.g., the fake BP Twitter account appropriated the real Twitter account), it produces a new interpretation, and it does not correspond to the original representation (e.g., the fake BP account did not correspond to the real BP Twitter account; Harold, 2004). Also, the appropriation should not be measured against the original representation (Harold, 2004).

This discussion of culture jamming results in a question about how Johnson & Johnson should have responded to the culture jamming YouTube video that someone created in response to the original Motrin ad. Therefore, this study asks

RQ 2: How should an organization respond to culture jamming during a preventable crisis?

Organizations' use of Twitter. Twitter is also used by organizations for crisis communication. Psychster Inc. conducted preliminary research in collaboration with Microsoft Learning about how best to reassure users during a site outage, and the study investigated how tweets influence brand perception and call center demand (Evans et al., 2011). The experimental study measured the impact of who tweeted and what was tweeted. The results revealed that during an online outage, the organization's social media manager should tweet to "acknowledge, inform and reassure" because half of the participants expressed that they would consult Twitter for information (Evans et al., 2011, p. 2).

The Psychster study also demonstrated that users appreciate when an organization advises users about what they should do in response to the crisis (Evans et al., 2011). Moreover, the results indicated that all tweets reduced participants' negative perceptions of the organization regardless of the cause, impact, or scale of the outage. Tweeting about whether the organization did not expect the outage was not favored by participants and actually increased the likelihood that participants would contact the support center. The effort of informing stakeholders and showing that the organization cares for them ultimately reduces an organization's cost and saves time. However, communication via Twitter is only effective when the social media manager or another employee who has built a relationship with the community tweets (Evans et al., 2011).

Twitter can be a useful tool for organizations during a crisis because it enables organizations to instantly respond, provide frequent updates, and actively engage in communication. However, it could hurt or further damage an organization's reputation as well. For example, Ketchum made a mistake when its vice president, James Andrews,

tweeted an insult to Memphis, the hometown of FedEx, which was one of its clients (Edwards, 2009).

Facebook in Crisis Communication

Audiences' use of Facebook. In the case of the Virginia Tech shooting in 2007, Facebook connected students and faculty (Palen et al., 2009). It also provided a way for parents and others to detect students' safety by viewing their online activities. In addition to individual news updates, a Virginia Tech student created a Facebook group called "I'm OK at VT" to allow people to self-report their safety. Facebook also had a list of 32 victims, which were later verified as correct identifications. This case study demonstrates that social media and social networking sites can be as credible as traditional media. The peer-generated list required participants to be accurate, and it seems as if they knew they had to be disciplined because this was a serious matter that was of national concern involving people's lives.

Organizations' use of Facebook. During the earthquake in Haiti, nonprofits and voluntary disaster organizations used social media channels such as Facebook to disseminate information about their programs and services. A content analysis study revealed that organizations' disaster communication on Twitter lasted longer than disaster communication on Facebook (Muralidharan et al., 2011). Other findings include that the most common information dissemination strategies used on Facebook were discussion walls, photos, and video files. The authors concluded that organizations should engage in more two-way communication through social media during crises.

Blogs in Crisis Communication

Blogs are also considered to be a form of social media because they enable interaction with audiences through the commenting feature. Although a blog's effects remain unknown, many organizations are using blogs with streaming video to build trust and communicate with key audiences (Oyer, 2010). An empirical research study showed that people assess the credibility of blogs by organizations and blogs by citizen groups similarly (Bates & Callison, 2008). During crises, the public increasingly turns to blogs for immediate information and in-depth coverage (Jin & Liu, 2010; Liu, 2009; C. Procopio & S. Procopio, 2007).

In some cases, audiences trust crisis coverage on blogs more than they trust traditional media (Horrigan & Morris, 2005; Liu, 2009; Schultz, Utz & Göritz, 2011; Sweetser & Metzgar, 2007). In addition, blogs can break a crisis story on average 55 days before online newspapers do, although this result is not statistically significant (Liu, 2009). It is also known that exposure to an organization's blog can have an impact on readers' perspectives toward the level of the crisis (Sweetser & Metzgar, 2007). In one study, those who read a blog post on an organization's website during a crisis thought that a crisis was not as severe as those who did not read a blog post about the crisis (Sweetser & Metzgar, 2007). This suggests that blogs are promising tools in crisis communication.

Despite this reality, many organizations and public relations professionals are still reluctant to adopt blogging as a crisis tactic (Jin & Liu, 2010; Kelleher, 2008; Kent, 2008). Potential reasons for not using blogs include a) practical problems, such as limited time, budget, knowledge and skills; b) unwillingness to deal with potential negative

consequences; and c) unsupportive perceptions among executives toward blogs as a conversational communication vehicle to benefit relationships with publics (Jin & Liu, 2010; Kelleher, 2008; Makovsky + Company, 2006; van der Wolf, 2007).

The blog-mediated crisis communication (BMCC) model deals with crises that are initiated by blogs or escalated by blogs (Jin & Liu, 2010). The Motrin ad case that is used in this study is an example of this type of crisis because it was escalated by blogs and other social media (Jin & Liu, 2010; Neff, 2008). The BMCC model can be used to help crisis managers monitor the blogosphere and understand how influential external blogs generate crisis information for key publics and interconnect with each other (Jin & Liu, 2010). Influential bloggers are bloggers who demonstrate leadership and influence and have followers who look forward to their posts for reasons such as inspiration, entertainment, ideas, suggestions, or news. External blogs are those generated by people outside of an organization (Jin & Liu, 2010).

To mitigate blog-initiated crises, organizations need to first evaluate the credibility of external blogs in terms of their outputs, outtakes, and outcomes (Jin & Liu, 2010). The *outputs* metric includes the number of posts about a crisis by valence, the number of comments about a crisis by valence, the number of unique visitors, the number of RSS subscribers, and the number of crisis-related links to and from other sites. The *outtakes* measure includes the search engine blog rank, third-party endorsements, and the business or media affiliation of the blogger. Finally, *outcomes* involve the key publics' awareness of the blog and the key publics' post-crisis trust of the blog.

Organizations can categorize publics in the following ways: publics who blog about the organizational crisis, publics who follow the crisis information-laden blogs,

publics who aren't exposed to the influential blogs, and media publics who follow and cover relevant crisis information (Jin & Liu, 2010). These publics interconnect with each other in the information flow described by the BMCC model. However, the model is only conceptual and has yet to be tested. Moreover, the model is delimited to providing guidance in the rumor generation phase.

YouTube in Crisis Communication

No extensive research could be found on the use of YouTube during organizational crises. However, an AdAge article discussed the JetBlue crisis during which passengers spent eight hours without water or bathrooms (Dumenco, 2011). The CEO published a YouTube video apology titled "Our Promise to You" and asked for a second chance. The author of the article argued that the YouTube video response is not going to replace the traditional, formal way of apologizing because the formal response increases the likelihood that the mainstream media will report the apology.

Research illustrates that social media are critical to organizations' crisis communications. Given some examples of successful and poor social media use during crises, it is still unclear how organizations can use social media effectively in a preventable crisis; many crisis studies focus on natural disasters such as earthquakes and other uncontrollable crisis situations where no one can really be deemed accountable. Thus, this study explores a final research question:

RQ 3: What additional insights can be learned about social media use during a preventable crisis?

Next chapter addresses why I took qualitative approach to this study and how exactly I conducted focus groups of moms. Recruitment, focus group procedure, and data analysis processes are discussed in depth. I also share my reflection and reaction.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

To discover participants' perceptions about the Motrin crisis and to learn about the content they expect organizations to provide on social media platforms during a crisis, I conducted three focus groups of 4-5 participants (with a total of 14 participants), which is a recommended focus group size by researchers (e.g., Daymon & Holloway, 2002; Kitzinger & Barbour, 1999; Lindlof, 1995; Krueger, 1998).

One of the features of qualitative data is that “they focus on naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings, so that we have a strong handle on what ‘real life’ is like” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10). Other strengths include their potential to reveal complex and rich descriptions and meanings about people's experiences and lives, as well as their flexibility in gathering. I selected a qualitative method for this study because I wished to ask participants open-ended questions to explore and interpret the meanings behind their real-life actions holistically. I also wanted the voices of participants to be represented in the results (Wolcott, 2001). An important drawback to qualitative research is that the data are not generalizable, although they do provide broad insight into similar situations (Barnett, 2002).

Focus groups allow researchers to gather participants' insights on a focused topic in a more efficient way than individual interviews (Morgan, 1997). They also have an advantage over other methods, such as interviews, because they offer “direct evidence about similarities and differences in the participants' opinions and experiences as opposed to reaching such conclusions from post hoc analyses of separate statements from each interviewee” (Morgan, 1997, p. 10). Moreover, in focus groups, participants have

more control over the direction of the discussion, which is especially useful in exploratory research. On the other hand, the researcher's influence on the data might be a disadvantage at the same time. In addition, participants may influence each other's opinions, as well as keep their opinions unstated because they may not feel comfortable sharing them in front of the group.

Case Selection

Participants shared their thoughts about the Motrin mom video advertisement that offended some parents. The Motrin mom case was chosen because it is a case in which moms used a variety of social media to express their disapproval, including a hashtag on Twitter (i.e., #MotrinMoms), blogs, video responses on YouTube, and a Facebook group, which attracted 1,300 people. These responses presented Johnson & Johnson with a variety of options for communication on the sites moms used to express their disapproval.

Recruitment

I recruited mothers in the Eugene and Springfield community who use at least one social media channel as a convenience sample. It would have been too difficult to recruit moms with babies because of their especially busy schedules, so I recruited moms with children. I limited the age of the children to 10 years or younger in the hopes of making this case more relevant to the participants. I also included pregnant women. I used to work as a homestay coordinator for International Affairs at the University of Oregon and have gotten to know a couple hundred local host families. I have kept good relationships with some of them, so I asked them individually if they would help me email (see Appendix B for the email script). I applied the snowball sampling technique and asked people to refer their friends to me. My friends and colleagues forwarded my recruitment

email to their friends, as well. In addition, I recruited participants through a status update on my Facebook page (see Appendix C for the status). I also sent Facebook messages to friends so that those who missed my status would get the message (see Appendix D for the message). Anyone who expressed interest received an informed consent email with participation and IRB information (see Appendix E for the email). To schedule the focus groups, I identified 25 possible times and asked participants to vote on Doodle. Based on participants' schedules, moms from countries outside of the United States (i.e., Italy, Ghana, Ethiopia, and Kyrgyzstan) happened to sign up for the second focus group time, with the exception of one participant. The first and third focus groups consisted of U.S. participants. The focus groups were held in a study group room in Peterson Hall, a participant's apartment, and my GTF office in the University of Oregon Annex. Drinks and snacks were provided, but there was no monetary compensation.

Focus Group Procedure

Because my focus groups were researcher-constituted groups where some members didn't know each other (Daymon & Holloway, 2002), the first 10 minutes were spent by discussing basic questions (see Appendix F for the semi-structured focus group protocol). Participants briefly introduced themselves and discussed their social media use.

After the initial conversation, participants were asked if they recalled Motrin's commercial that was directed to moms who wear their babies in slings or wraps. Next, participants watched the Motrin advertisement and shared their reactions (see Appendix G for a transcript of the commercial). Then, participants saw moms' social media backlash in response to the ad. First, they watched 40 seconds of a video that featured tweets from angry moms (see Appendix K for the transcript) and a self-video response

from an outraged mom that were posted to YouTube (see Appendix L for the transcript). Next, they watched a cultural jamming YouTube video response that mocks the original Motrin ad that attracted about 103,000 views (see Appendix J for the transcript). Then, they read a sample blog post by an angry mom and sample comments to the post (see Appendix I for the post and comments). The particular blog post was selected because it was written by one of the most active bloggers who was quick to respond to the Motrin ad, and the concerns she voiced generated many comments. Finally, they read the first two pages of the wall of a Facebook group called “Babywearing isn’t painful. Boycott Motrin for saying it is” with 1,063 members (see Appendix M for the Facebook pages). There was another group, “Boycott Motrin,” that 1,300 people joined, but it is no longer available.

Then, participants were asked if Johnson & Johnson should have responded to the backlash on each of the social media channels, and if so, why and how the organization could have done that, and if not, why. In the second half of the focus group, they discussed what the organization could do to achieve various things such as sounding honest and genuine, minimizing power differences, and involving moms in the creation of the ad.

Because the second group strongly voiced that Johnson & Johnson did not need to respond, I skipped several questions that asked if the company should have responded to each social media channel and how it should do so. Additionally, I tried to be as flexible as possible, and when the end of the allotted hour was near, I made sure certain questions were answered. I took the last couple of minutes to ask them to read Johnson & Johnson’s apology letter that appeared on its website, in addition to a blogger’s email and

the organization's reply (see Appendix A for the email exchange) to discover participants' reactions (see Appendix H for the letter). At the end, I asked if there was anything they wanted to add. I recorded the conversations during the focus group sessions.

Throughout the process, I worked as a facilitator and encouraged everyone to speak instead of letting a few individuals dominate the conversation. I also did memoing, recording notes during the focus group about important quotes and themes that stood out (see Miles & Huberman, 1994). When I needed clarification about what participants meant in their responses, I restated or summarized what I heard and asked if my summary was accurate to enhance the authenticity of this study (see Marshall & Rossman, 2010). Moreover, I took notes about their physical reactions and things they emphasized as well.

Data Analysis

After transcribing the audio of the focus groups, I followed Miles and Huberman's (1994) framework for data analysis. The analysis consists of three stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. The first step was to familiarize and induce the data by simplifying or writing up a summary of what I saw in the transcripts. I wrote descriptions next to small chunks of information in the margin. I used the present progressive tense when doing so (e.g., "acknowledging and engaging," "linking back to the original post," "not needing an apology," "asking moms," "being selective about which posts to respond to," and "working as ad strategy.") During the second stage, I organized the information retrieved in the previous stage in a systematic way by putting sentences into categories based on their relevance to each of the three research questions. A lot of them overlapped – data that could go under the first question

could also go under the third question. However, I tried to differentiate the two by thinking about one as content-focused and the other as channel-focused. The last stage allowed me to interpret meanings that emerged from the data. During this stage, I searched for recurrent patterns or themes that captured something important about the data. In addition, I highlighted major quotes, key points, and emerging themes, as well as points that participants were most enthusiastic in talking about. Transcriptions of all of the focus groups were compared and contrasted until the data provided no more new insights. Finally, I organized my findings by examining how they related to dialogic theory.

As qualitative researchers have suggested, I embraced diverse and new perspectives and interpretations in a contextualized way and stayed flexible and open to changes. I was receptive to what the data revealed. Later on, I followed up with all participants via email and two of them also via phone to further explore the ideas and to get some clarification after the preliminary research analysis. Eight people responded. Later, I did member checks by sending result and discussion sections to five participants. They confirmed the content and interpretation with me.

Reflexivity and Reactivity

Although I have worked at child care centers, done babysitting, lived with little boys and have many people with babies around, including my sister, I'm not a parent or target audience of the Motrin ad myself. I can see how some people might have been offended by the ad, although I do not think the ad is that bad. It's clear to me that Johnson & Johnson didn't intend to offend people; it was a mistake. When I conducted the research, I was careful not to let my biases affect the way I facilitated the focus groups

and analyzed my data. I respected my participants and was open to their reactions to the ad. Additionally, because I'm from Japan and English isn't my first language, it is possible that my language skills affected the level of depth achieved in this study. As I mentioned earlier, I tried my best to compensate by asking them to repeat or rephrase when I wasn't sure what they meant.

As for reactivity, the level of familiarity with social media among participants might have affected how comfortable those without much experience felt. For instance, in the first group, everyone except one was either a professor or graduate student. They were active on social media and had expertise in the related field. However, the one who wasn't as familiar with social media as the rest of the group was a stay-at-home mom, and she might have felt as if she had been left out or she had not been able to contribute much.

Moreover, as a researcher, I tried my best not to judge any opinion or do something that might appear that I'm taking a side. Therefore, I restrained myself from saying, for instance, "That's a good idea" or "I agree." Instead, I said, "I see" or, "Thank you for your insight." It was uncomfortable for me not to be able to react in the supportive way I would naturally do. I hope my participants didn't take my reactions as not being interested in or valuing their thoughts.

Following chapter examines the results of the study. First, it mentions general responses participants had to the ad. Then, it explores each research question. The first question is organized based on the five dimensions of the dialogic public relations theory.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

General Response to the Ad

The participants' reactions to the Motrin ad varied, especially with the international participants from the second group, who were not offended by the ad. The first and third groups thought the ad was offensive, particularly the following lines: "Supposedly, it's a real bonding experience," "Plus, it totally makes me look like an official mom," and "So, if look tired and crazy, people will understand why." They characterized the ad as "condescending," "patronizing," "polarizing," and "judgmental." They reported that Johnson & Johnson was responsible for responding to the uproar that appeared on social media. However, they thought those moms who wrote blog posts and posted YouTube videos were extreme. Conversation around this point in the third group went like this:

"I'm always surprised how mad people get. I understand that you could go, "wow" but..."

"Yeah, you don't have to be like..."

"Yeah, and how can you get mad like that and when states pass bills that are completely anti-women, nobody gets mad, in my opinion, and even vote for them."

"And they freak out about some stupid commercials. They are freaking out! 'Omg!' But if you have babies, you have something better you should be angry about. You really, really do. There are lots of things out there."

So the general reaction across the groups was that this Motrin advertisement was a minor deal.

Therefore, most participants were reluctant to say that the company needed to apologize. A mom explained that one of the considerations to make in deciding whether to apologize is how many people were offended. “Is it one out of a lot, or is it... what does it constitute in terms of the base of the folks who are responding?... I mean, I think companies sometimes don’t have a responsibility to apologize because you always offend somebody.” Another mom agreed: “I was going to say, I’m not sure if an apology per se is necessary but the beauty of social media is that they can be a part of the conversation and not only to know what people are saying but to participate in it.”

Most moms in the second focus group also didn’t think the company should apologize; in fact, the international participants were not offended. They didn’t really understand why other moms were mad. A mom who was most frustrated with the angry moms said, “You have colored people, you have people with long hair, people with short hair, people with curly hair. Italian. I mean... people make fun of us every day. Pizza Hut. That’s what people do. Why should I be offended?” She also said, “As a mom, you have so much to worry about... about your child and then your body. You’re going to have probably depression. Your boobs are going to be shit, your vagina is not going to look not like it was before, and stitches.” They thought the company did not have to respond to online comments because no matter what, an ad will offend someone. Some international participants also said that people in their countries wouldn’t complain about offensive advertisements. A mom from Ghana said: “If it’s about politics or something serious, we complain. But if it’s just an offensive advertisement, we think by ourselves. You know,

how Americans complain a lot about everything? We don't do that." A mom from Kyrgyzstan also said, "People see no point in publically complaining because no one will listen or change anything."

They even justified the ad in a way by saying that it was an effective marketing strategy because it created buzz and now people would go buy the product: "I mean, the thing is, they made this ad. They always make choice to attract, I mean, people." Then she brought up the controversial advertising campaign, "Just For Men," from 2011 for the Dr. Pepper Ten diet soda. She said, "It's not for women. This is men's choice. See? It's offensive. They made a choice to offend someone. But it was advertisement at the same time. I was eager to drink it. It's business." Her point was that the ad ultimately did the job – to catch attention and create a buzz. "So whatever you do, it's about how you strategize to offend somebody. But offending somebody at the same time includes the marketing." She therefore thinks the campaign was successful: "I will go drink it. So even people are opposed to this advertisement, maybe they will keep buying the product." Others agreed. Notably, everyone in the second group was from a country other than the United States, other than the one person who was slightly offended, who said, "I kind of get why people should be offended. I think I would be offended seeing this ad...I think my cousin would be offended."

RQ 1: How Does Dialogic Public Relations Theory Inform Desired Responses to a Preventable Crisis If at All?

With the exception of international respondents, who were not offended, most participants thought the organization should respond on social media. One mom emphasized that it should also include other caretakers, such as fathers and grandparents.

Below, focus group results are organized based on the five dimensions of the dialogic public relations theory.

Mutuality. Regarding collaboration and the spirit of mutual equality, several participants said that the use of social media minimizes the power difference between themselves and organizations. They explained that organizations can use social media to engage in dialogue to show they understand people's reactions. One person expressed the point: "Even acknowledging that something is going on would calm people. 'Ok, they're acknowledging that I'm here.'" Another added: "They've heard me. Isn't it true in all of the personal relationships, right?" She clarified that part of the reason why those angry moms expressed their opinions on social media was to tell Johnson & Johnson that they were mad.

In addition, participants said that they would like to be invited to share their stories. For example, they said that Johnson & Johnson could gather a group of moms and ask, "What are your experiences with babywearing?" or "How can Johnson & Johnson help you with parenting?" Most participants also explained that if an organization wants to do a video response, the employees of the company should be in the video to minimize the power difference. By appearing in the video, employees would make themselves vulnerable by having to reveal their identities.

Propinquity. Part of engagement is being accessible for publics during a crisis. Participants had various ideas of how quickly an organization should respond, ranging from "within hours" to "two or three days." Another consideration is "how they position themselves." A mom elaborated on this point: "I think it would be accessible if the way of writing created an ...open loop, so if they write it in a way where everything is a

closed book, then they shut down the conversations. But if they provide the forum or place to comment, then they would be more open.” Many moms expected the open communication to come from people at the executive level.

Also for engagement, as well as immediacy of presence, U.S. participants thought Johnson & Johnson should have used two-way communication through social media prior to launching the advertisement. One participant stated, “I’m thinking, where’s the research on this?” She thought the ad had “contrary information,” meaning that it didn’t capture moms’ real feelings for their babies. Others also agreed that the ad didn’t accurately represent moms and their stance on the issue of parenting and the pain associated with it. “People who made this in these positions had no idea,” one said. “I was thinking when I was watching this too, ‘No women wrote this. No women who had a baby wrote this.’” U.S. participants thought that an organization should share potentially offensive campaign ideas and advertisements in progress through social media before launching them and ask for feedback. One idea that emerged was to start a Facebook page and ask, “What are you using Motrin for?” Several moms expressed that this channel would instantly give Johnson & Johnson the ability to create a focus group. “I want to tell you,” said one of them. Participants suggested that organizations provide incentives such as free samples in exchange for people’s feedback.

In terms of temporal flow with regard to treating publics equitably, nearly all U.S. participants thought that it was unrealistic and unnecessary for companies to respond to every single comment on the various social media channels for cases of offensive advertising. For instance, participants noticed that the Facebook group page that was created to protest Motrin carried mostly irrelevant posts. “They can’t respond to each

person because there are trolls out there, butt-heads out there,” said a participant. “Some of them are over the top.” Another participant pointed out that if the organization is not selective, there might be a possibility of getting “the backlash from the other side for catering to these crazy moms.” Although most U.S. respondents thought that selective commenting was appropriate, one U.S. respondent thought that it was important to respond to everything or nothing: “It’s a bad choice to ignore everything. It’s a good choice to respond, but you have to be responding to everybody.” International participants did not believe that the company needed to respond. All participants from this group thought that if a company were going to issue a response, it would need to respond to everyone.

For preventable crises that are a bigger deal than offensive advertising (such as a crisis resulting in people getting injured), a few moms in the third group thought that an organization should respond to individual comments, no matter how much time it takes. As an example, one mentioned the case of the 2008 melamine tainted baby formula scandal in China: “Where people are actually in danger, I would definitely expect them to do the individual thing... This Facebook [page] and that Facebook [page] and make as many thousands of postings as necessary. Another followed: “I think, if they went and did something like that, they should try to do that to every blog post, even though it takes time. That shows their effort and how sorry they are.”

Empathy. Regarding supportiveness, U.S. participants thought that the organization should engage in dialogue when interacting with angry moms (international respondents did not think the organization should respond at all). For example, one participant stated, “Conversation is what’s the most important thing.” Another agreed:

“There’s always a way to respond. And they need to be part of that response.” “I think it takes the wind out of sails sometimes with people that are upset, if somebody just says, ‘Hey, that’s an interesting response! We didn’t know you were going to have that response.’” Publics might not perceive an organization’s response to be empathic if the response is focused on why the organization originally thought the offensive advertising was a good idea:

I wouldn’t let them explain their motive because I think that that would also make people mad. So if you do an apology, sometimes when you justify the way you did it...you’re like, ‘I’m sorry, but I was really saying this’ in a way it kind of makes people feel like you didn’t take it serious. So I think sometimes you should just say, ‘look, we realize there’re lots of people hurt. We’re sincerely sorry for this.’ But do not explain anymore that they’re validating once again.

Community building through a communal orientation could include a good apology. There was not an agreement on whether a general or specific apology was better, but the majority wanted specifics that tell them the company truly understood what it did wrong. One person said: “I want them to acknowledge specifics...a very general apology, I’d go ‘really? What part are you apologizing for? Are you apologizing for type of face? Are you apologizing for this part of it or that part of it?’” She explained that she is frustrated when a company apologizes for things other than what people are mad about. She is also a middle school teacher and when she deals with upset parents, she finds it helpful to say, “Sorry about the miscommunication about this specific thing.” So her approach might come from there. Another mom would take a different approach, explaining, “I would not be as detailed in that.”

Participants in the third group thought that the communication act of charity or sponsorship was another way to engage in community building: “‘Hey, look. We’re putting our money in and now we’re going to use it for something good.’ I think that, that does something even though that doesn't make everything right, but that shows that they gave up something.” Participants noted that the contribution would not have to be monetary; it could be a contribution of time and labor. An example raised was efforts to assist with the 2008 Hurricane Katrina recovery because that was the year when the Motrin ad was put out. A mom said that Johnson & Johnson could have donated free baby food or products for families who were suffering from the disaster. The company could also have sent volunteers to community events that are designed to build relationships between parents and their children. Participants in the group thought that there were so many things organizations could do to show their sincere apology and loyalty to their stakeholders and if they do such things, people will notice and share what the company is doing on social media channels. As mentioned in the first group, Twitter may be an ideal channel for sharing the steps an organization is taking in its community because it’s more instantaneous, quick and short, compared to other tools such as a blog or Facebook. The last component of empathy, confirmation, has been addressed with regard to the previously discussed findings under mutuality about the importance of acknowledgement.

Risk. As previously mentioned, participants thought that if Motrin produced a video response, it should feature the employees, which would make them more personally vulnerable to criticism. When participants were shown Motrin’s response, most people liked the line in which the vice president of marketing revealed that she

herself was a mom of three daughters. Revealing this personal information meant a lot to most participants, although some moms thought it might be a strategy and not really genuine: “It might be a strategy... There’s no such thing as hones[ty] in business.” A mom added that the vice president could have included in her personal experience about babywearing but doubted that she’d ever used a baby sling because of her good occupation. Another agreed that it would’ve been a good idea for her to draw upon more of her personal stories, although they acknowledged that there is a danger that too much focus on babywearing experiences would distract from the focus on the apology.

Moms wanted the company to show more vulnerability by at least listing the CEO’s name next to the name of the vice president for marketing. One participant said, “I feel like the CEO of Johnson & Johnson should also have said something because, for instance, when they do a financial report, the CEO has to sign and say ‘we are going to vouch for the record,’ right?” Another said, “And I understand her department is directly related to what’s going on. But I still assume the official public apology comes from the CEO of the company, no matter who was... When the chicken are killed for KFC, we expect the statement comes from the CEO [of the KFC] and not the chicken slaughters.” Moms in the third focus group expressed disappointment that they did not see “Johnson & Johnson” in either the emails to bloggers or the website apology statement. They thought that this was to prevent consumers from associating this crisis with the company and from damaging the company’s reputation.

Unanticipated consequences result from spontaneous and non-scripted responses. Although many participants recognized that the organization probably wanted to carefully plan its statements to be clear and consistent, they thought the apology letter

issued on the company's website lacked heart. Members of the first focus group offered the following reactions:

“There isn't really warmth to it. I mean, there can be.”

“Especially because the ad was so sassy.”

“Turn on a little bit of that – ‘we're best friends!’ – that's better.”

“Yeah, as if you were talking to women. It's so touch-down, corporate tone.”

Participants in the third focus group agreed and explained that the message sounded “extremely careful and bland.” They also felt as if the company were trying to “apologize without actually saying sorry.” Some participants expressed that a video would be good if it looked spontaneous and did not have a high production value: “It should not be overly polished with whiz bang animations and such, like an ad. It should be shot in a low-key setting.”

Regarding the recognition of strange otherness, all participants thought it was impossible for Johnson & Johnson to show that it values each person's reaction regardless of what the reaction is because some reactions are from “trolls” looking to stir up trouble.

Nevertheless, the company could show that it values the various comments that are serious:

It seems like there are major themes. So they could say, “A lot of you are concerned about this, a lot of you are concerned about this.” There will definitely still be some people who are irritated by this, regardless.

Similarly, another participant explained

If it's the one [blog post] that got the most hits, then they can even say, well, 'This is the one that got us most thinking.' I mean, the best PR is honest conversations with the audience. It's not pandering to them. And that's why BP got such a problem because they weren't actually talking to them.

Commitment. For genuineness, some participants thought an organization's official social media channels would be good for showing honest and forthright communication. For example, one participant stated

I use it a lot in my connection to information and trust it a lot. Many organizations post their videos there to be easily accessed. I think a Johnson & Johnson channel would be a logical place it would appear, just like many organizations and companies and even rockstars have their own YouTube channel.

She also stated that a company could show its genuineness and honesty by being humble and admitting its weaknesses.

However, many participants expressed that they wouldn't visit an organization's social media channels for more information or an apology. A few participants said that they would not associate honesty with YouTube: "I wouldn't believe it if it was from them on YouTube." Most participants agreed that a company website and trusted parenting blogs such as parenting.com would be more ideal places to show honest communication.

In addition, participants expressed that the company's future actions would help them interpret the sincerity of the apology: "I think that for me, it's not so much the words and where it's put, but if it's sincere in a sense that 'ok, they say that...but are they

actually changing their business practices?’ So if I get an apology, that might not be enough for me,” said a mom. “I feel like just the words alone are not enough.”

For commitment to conversation, many moms expected that Johnson & Johnson would need to show that it wants to have conversations for a good cause that benefits both parties. A mom said that “engagement and acknowledgement” plays an important role. “To me, it’s good to get the conversation going.” Regarding commitment to interpretation, an organization can demonstrate its effort to understand audiences’ perspectives by genuinely showing that it understood what made people mad, being more engaging with the audience, and asking questions about the babywearing experience. A mom had a unique idea about how Johnson & Johnson can show that it understands audiences’ perspectives:

One thing that I think might be cool is that if they got a group of vocal people together, real moms, real women, because there is plenty of pain that’s associated with motherhood that does not come from babywearing. So if they come up with a follow-up commercial and that’s really well done, and really on-point, and took into account all, you know, all that reality... I think [that] would be a cool response because that works for everyone. It works for the company because they get a great ad, and they get to say that they really responded well, and all the women would feel like they are heard, and there’s an ad there that might speak to other people.

RQ 2: How Should an Organization Respond to Culture Jamming During a Preventable Crisis?

All of the participants agreed that there was no need for Johnson & Johnson to respond to the cultural jamming video on YouTube. The dominant reason was that the video was a “joke” and it would be waste of time to respond to that. “It’s not furthering the conversation in any way. It was a funny parody, and it’s got the ridiculousness of the emotion behind the original ad,” a participant said. “Unless they want to acknowledge it was funny,” another said. One pointed out that you don’t respond to Saturday Night Live shows or comments to the shows – there’s a certain degree of mutual understanding between both parties. The whole point is to be funny and that you shouldn’t take it too personally or seriously.

They also thought that responding to a culture jamming video could backfire: “The video was reaction...reaction to the reaction is horrible.” An interesting idea that came up was that if the company really wants to respond, it could make a “mock-mock ad” to come back to its original ad to make it right this time. In doing so, the company could respond to the uproar by clarifying its intent and ridiculing itself as a supplemental apology.

Participants had mixed feelings about the idea. Among the respondents to my follow-up email, four supported or at least saw the potential in the mock-mock ad, and four thought it wasn’t a good idea. One who liked the idea said: “That would be amusing. And if they did it well, it would probably gain enough word of mouth to really spread their message quickly. It would also show they had a sense of humor about their mistake, which is always a good thing.” Another agreed: “I think the mock-mock video would be

a really innovative response. It would show that the company gets it.” On the other hand, a participant who didn’t support the idea responded: “I don’t think it would be good for them to ridicule themselves in the ad.” Another also said, “Move forward, not backward, and just leave the old, tainted ad to its grave.” This comment was followed by, “I don’t think it’s a good idea to use a ‘mock-mock’ commercial. They will look stupid and no one will take them seriously. I think they have to be serious if there is a problem.” A respondent expressed her excitement about the idea yet showed caution: “I think this is a great idea. The company being able to laugh at themselves is a great way to take the wind out of the naysayer’s sails. On the other hand, they would need to be careful to not offend yet another group with a parody. It’s tricky.”

RQ 3: What Additional Insights Can Be Learned About Social Media Use During a Preventable Crisis?

Participants noted that for serious preventable crises, they might prefer to learn about a crisis through established third party sources, such as The New York Times, Huffington Post, or broadcast news channels, although it would be important for a company to include an acknowledgement and apology on its website and social media channels, as well. Participants explained that a video apology by the CEO would be needed for a serious crisis: “It would be interesting to see a video apology on YouTube and would show the company was indeed taking the issue very seriously. It seems like it would be overkill in this situation.” Another noted: “It would need to have a clear-cut admission of wrongdoing, probably by someone female who is high up on the chain of decisions at Johnson & Johnson.” She suggested also that the organization should “cross-post the video on their website.” Another thought the video is definitely more desirable if

it appeared on the company website. She said, “I think if it is a video response, it should go onto the company website, seems more professional to me.” Participants also mentioned that the message would not need to necessarily be different based on the social media channel: “It sounds like responses are the same across the board.” Participants said that the only difference would be that micro sites such as LinkedIn and Twitter might be used to drive traffic to messages that need to be longer than 140 characters: “Twitter only gives 140 characters, so you can’t exactly do the same thing you do.”

The last chapter summarizes the overall results and explores what they mean theoretically and practically to public relations practitioners. It also explores an important finding about the different perceptions toward an offensive advertisement American and international moms had. Finally, the limitations of this study and possibilities for future research are addressed.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study is among the first to apply the dialogic public relations theory to an organization's social media response during a preventable crisis. Regarding the first research question, participants' answers reinforced the salience of all of the characteristics of effective dialogue, as described by the theory. The aspects that were especially a good fit were mutuality, propinquity, and empathy because of the nature of social media as instantaneous, pervasive, and spontaneous (even when it's scripted). Social media are also more personable, which is important in relationship building. What people need the most when offended by an advertisement is acknowledgement and engagement. Social media are ideal for these purposes.

On the other hand, risk and commitment were not as effectively used as the first three for the dialogic theory. Risk taking for social media could include revealing rather private information about the company's practices online, personal information about their employees, and including employees in videos. Commitment for social media involves demonstrating a genuine desire to have ongoing conversations and relationships to serve the audience better and not just to gain more profits. For both aspects, the main challenge seems to be showing honesty, as one said, "Even if they are apologizing, they are not being honest. So why would they fake?" It might be that because it's easier and less time consuming for a company to post something on Twitter or Facebook as opposed to newspaper or TV, the audience doesn't trust the response on social media. Combined with general distrust in business practices, it's hard for an organization to show that it is sincere, loyal, and committed to its audience. As one person expressed, "I feel like not

that you can buy people's love, but if you're looking at this business, you kind of talk about...well, it's a company, it speaks about money..." Even when it reveals more information, people don't necessarily believe it.

Responses to the second research question suggest that dialogic theory is not always relevant to strategic social media use because there are times when organizations should refrain from online dialogue. Specifically, an organization should be careful about engaging in dialogue in response to culture jamming. Anyone with access in this digital era can have a voice on social media, so organizations need to evaluate which comments and multimedia it legitimately needs to respond to in order to be accountable. Moreover, the purpose of the information must be relevant. Organizations can ask whether the authors are just having fun, if they are really mad, if they are calling for actions, and why they might be sharing the video. In addition, it might be smart for organizations to avoid overreacting when they think that the public does not take a culture jamming artifact seriously. There is a great value on entertainment in U.S. culture, and sarcasm and cynicism are common.

For the third research question, participants tended to trust traditional media more than social media. When they seek information online, they go to a company's website and parental blogs. In that case, organizations should consider responding to offensive advertising on their websites and approaching popular parental blogs. Additionally, compared to regular social media sites where anyone can post anything, the organization's own channels, especially the official blog, were found to be more credible among moms. The establishment of online trust could result in people being more willing to turn to social media channels during a preventable crisis.

Findings suggested that, overall, U.S. respondents were at least slightly “put off” by the advertisement and agreed that organizations should use social media to respond quickly and to keep the audience in the loop during crises, especially when the crisis is major. On the other hand, the international participants were not offended, so they did not think the company needed to respond. Thus, cultural differences can account for whether a public is offended by an advertisement. Likewise, they also affect how people react when they see a controversial advertisement. In Japan, for instance, people are not used to showing their anger, frustration, dissatisfaction, or complaints. So, it is likely that if someone is offended by an advertisement, he or she will not say anything. International participants said that similarly, people in their countries wouldn’t usually voice their concerns either. This means that a company should keep those people in mind and reach out to them as well for serious crises. On the contrary, people in the U.S. in general are much more vocal and confrontational, which means that organizations are more likely to hear from them when they are upset by an organization’s misconduct.

Hall (1976) distinguished the differences as high-context and low-context cultures, depending on the nature of communication. Countries like Japan and Mexico have high-context cultures in which communications involve “pre-programmed information that is, in the receiver and in the setting, with only minimal information in the transmitted message” (Hall, p. 101). So, speakers and listeners are expected to share the values, beliefs and norms; therefore, they are expected to understand each other without explaining everything. What is not stated in the communication is often more important than what is stated, so the listener has more responsibility on deriving meaning from the verbal message. On the other hand, high-context cultures in countries such as

the U.S. and Germany require more explicit language, as opposed to nuance and silence, leaving less room for assumptions. Therefore, it is safe to say people who are familiar with this type of culture tend to be more individualistic and opinionated, and they are trained to use words to convey the exact meaning.

As a mom from Ghana mentioned that people in her country become more vocal when it comes to “politics or something more serious,” people’s reactions might depend not only on dominant communication style but also on the roles regulations and policies play in society. Additionally, formality might be also relevant. In Asian cultures, formality is highly valued and that influences how people behave. In Japan, for example, saving face and maintaining “wa” or harmony are critical aspects of communication. People avoid confrontation and direct criticism, which lead to the embarrassment of the others and destruction of the societal harmony and peace. Thus, responses based on these cultural differences to an offensive advertisement might be an interesting area of study. In this digital era where companies have less ability to target their audience for their online presence, including their use of advertisements, relationships and communications with stakeholders become much more complex.

Another thing concluded from the results is that a company can’t be free from responsibility after publishing an apology; it needs to work toward regaining people’s trust. Therefore, what the organization does after the incident is a key indicator of how people perceive the organization’s sincerity.

Theoretical Reinforcement

This study’s results about how a company can respond to a crisis with social media fit well with the five components of dialogic theory, which suggests that the theory

is robust and lends itself well to social media. The findings indicated that for mutuality, an organization should devote itself to having two-way, open communications with its publics. It should listen to what publics say and be flexible to making adjustments, depending on the feedback it receives. To achieve propinquity, people want to be invited to participate in the decision making process because that way, they feel they can have some influence over the organization. Even when people do not expect a company to apologize, it still needs to show empathy by acknowledging what people are saying to show that it is attentive and understanding.

For risk, an organization needs to be honest and genuine in crisis communication. While people may not associate those good characteristics with a business, it still can try to show these characteristics by being more transparent about itself, which will make it more vulnerable. Finally, commitment is important in dialogue; however, it is best shown through actions that give credibility to an organization's words. Actions include not only removing the offensive advertising or directly solving the problem at stake but also making contributions to the community and changing internal conditions such as policies and facility services.

Practical Recommendations

Organizations should use social media to rebuild their relationships with upset stakeholders by selectively responding to online comments. Although some people may disagree, the general opinion among participants was that organizations do not have to respond to every comment because it's inevitable to offend someone and because there are trolls out there who just want to get attention and cause unwarranted trouble. Thus,

companies should identify the popular posts people are reading and respond to those posts. Knowing when to drop the conversation is something to consider, as well.

Although an apology isn't always needed, organizations should publically recognize people's feelings by saying something such as, "Many of you told us..." This will not only validate people's concerns but also show that the organization is listening and trying to make things better. When deciding to post an apology, organizations can use social media such as Twitter to direct people to the apology. It would most likely be perceived well if the response showed that the company was taking full responsibility by having the parent company's name and the CEO's signature listed along with the person who is in charge of the case. Also, while an organization can include its intention in its explanation, it must be careful to not emphasize this to avoid sounding like it is making excuses or justifying what it did.

For tactics, an organization should respond on the social media channels that its target audience is using to reach the same audience who is causing the uproar. It is a good idea to create key places for conversations on the organization's social media channels (such as the organization's blog and Facebook fan page) and using the hashtag that people have created for the crisis on Twitter. A video apology is generally not expected unless a crisis is major. When organizations use a video to respond to a crisis, the video should be hosted on the organization's website and possibly its YouTube channel, which would enable interaction. The video should include the CEO and possibly others who are responsible.

Most of the participants emphasized the importance of organizations taking actions to back up their words. Charity work, contributions, or sponsorships involving an

organization the offended public cares about can help, and organizations can use their social media channels to keep people informed.

To conclude, knowing the audience members well by monitoring their conversations and engaging in dialogue with them on a daily basis will benefit the organization when a crisis hits because it will know how and where to respond. Social media are ideal ways to do that thanks to its immediate, pervasive, spontaneous, and two-way nature of communication.

Limitations

As a qualitative study, the results are not generalizable. However, the study can be evaluated in terms of transferability, which is a qualitative measure that asks whether the results are presented in a way that allows others to apply them in their contexts (Barnett, 2002). In addition, some of the participants fundamentally differed from the online angry public by not having a problem with the ad; however, this also revealed interesting information about this group of people. Moreover, there is no way of knowing whether the requested response would ultimately disadvantage the company with stakeholders. For example, the company could be better off by not further publicizing the crisis through its communications. Another limitation is that one of the Facebook groups, “Boycott Motrin,” is no longer available, so only one of the two Facebook groups was used to prompt participant reactions.

Future Research

This study focused on the use of social media during one type of preventable crisis: offensive advertising. Future research can examine audience expectations for other types of preventable crises, as well as types of crises other than preventable ones. Also,

research can investigate additional ways that organizations can respond in a sensitive, inclusive way to stakeholders during crises. Finally, future research might explore the geographic cultural differences among types of stakeholders in their reactions to bold advertisements, given that advertisements can be particularly explicit depending on the location.

APPENDIX A

AMY GATES' EMAIL TO MOTRIN AND RESPONSE FROM MOTRIN

This is an email an upset blogger sent through her personal email directly to Kathy Widmer, the vice president of marketing for McNeil Consumer Healthcare. And the following is the response from Widmer.

Motrin's new ad campaign targeting babywearing is offensive, disrespectful and wrong on so many levels. If a mom is experiencing significant pain from wearing her baby, then she needs to adjust her carrier/sling or try another one. Babywearing has so many proven benefits to both mom and baby and women have been wearing babies since the beginning of time. Stop disrespecting us moms, Motrin. Unlike our babies, we weren't born yesterday and we will take our \$ elsewhere.

Response from Kathy Widmer

Dear Amy -

I am the Vice President of Marketing for McNeil Consumer Healthcare. I have responsibility for the Motrin Brand, and am responding to concerns about recent advertising on our website. I am, myself, a mom of 3 daughters.

We certainly did not mean to offend moms through our advertising. Instead, we had intended to demonstrate genuine sympathy and appreciation for all that parents do for their babies. We believe deeply that moms know best and we sincerely apologize for disappointing you. Please know that we take your feedback seriously and will take swift action with regard to this ad. We are in process of removing it from our website. It will take longer, unfortunately, for it to be removed from magazine print as it is currently on newstands and in distribution.

-Kathy

Kathy Widmer VP of Marketing – Pain, Pediatrics, GI, Specialty McNeil Consumer Healthcare 215-273-8192 kwidmer@mccus.jnj.com

APPENDIX B

RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Hi, (name),

I'm conducting a study in the School of Journalism and Communication at the University of Oregon for my master's thesis, and I'm wondering if you might be able to help me by participating in a focus group.

I'm researching how organizations can use social media effectively during crises. I'd like to find out what moms want to see on organizations' social media channels such as blogs, Facebook fan pages, and Twitter feeds. This study will result in suggestions for professional communicators about how to communicate effectively in crisis situations.

I am inviting you to participate in this study because you are a mom who I know through the Friendship Foundation of International Students at the Office of International Affairs where I used to work as a homestay coordinator under the supervision of Becky Megerssa.

Your identity would be kept confidential and would not be connected with the information you would provide. To be eligible for the focus group, you need to use at least one social media channel, such as Facebook.

I'll ask you to vote on Doodle to decide the dates and times later once participants are identified. The focus group would last about an hour in a room on the University campus. I would be recording the conversation for accuracy and transcription. The audio and video recording would occur and be destroyed within six months of the focus groups and only I would hear or see it.

Thank you so much for your consideration. Participation in the study is completely voluntary, and it's fine to not participate. If you would like to participate or have any questions about the study, please email me at mnakai@uoregon.edu or call me at 541-514-2781. You are also welcome to contact my faculty supervisor, Tiffany Gallicano, with questions at derville@uoregon.edu or (541) 346-2035.

Sincerely,

Maiko Nakai
Graduate Student
School of Journalism and Communication
University of Oregon

APPENDIX C

RECRUITMENT ON FACEBOOK STATUS

I am looking for moms with children who are 10 years old or younger to participate in a focus group for my master's thesis. Please send me a direct message or email me at mnakai@uoregon.edu if you can help me.

APPENDIX D

RECRUITMENT VIA FACEBOOK MESSAGE

Hi, (name),

How are you?

I'm conducting a study in the School of Journalism and Communication at the University of Oregon for my master's thesis, and I'm wondering if you might be able to help me by participating in a focus group.

I'm researching how organizations can use social media effectively during crises. I'd like to find out what moms want to see on organizations' social media channels such as blogs, Facebook fan pages and Twitter feeds.

If you might be able to help me, please send me your email address so that I can give you more details, including the focus group times. The audio and video recordings will occur. Your participation would be completely voluntary, and your identity would be kept confidential using fake names.

If you have any questions, please contact me at mnakai@uoregon.edu, 541-514-2781, or simply reply to this message on Facebook. You are also welcome to contact my faculty supervisor, Tiffany Gallicano, with questions at derville@uoregon.edu or (541) 346-2035.

Thank you, and I hope you are well.

Best,
Maiko

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT EMAIL

Dear (name),

Thank you again for expressing interest in the study, which looks at a controversial online advertisement to examine how an organization and PR practitioners can use social media such as blogs and Twitter effectively during crisis situations. Below is additional information about the focus groups. If you decide to participate, you would discuss your feelings and opinions regarding a crisis case that was selected. More precisely, you would discuss your reactions to the advertisement affecting moms and how the organization responded or should have responded. Free discussion is encouraged, and I will have some questions prepared.

There is no personal benefit for participating in this study. The information you provide will contribute to knowledge about organizational crisis communication practices using social media.

The audio and video recordings will occur. The recordings will be stored on my laptop and I'm the only one who has access to the data, which will be destroyed within the six months of the focus group. Your identity will be kept confidential by using fake names and will not be connected with the information you would provide. However, absolute confidentiality will not be guaranteed with focus groups because I can't control what individual members will share outside the settings afterwards. At the same time, I would like to ask you not to share yours and others' opinions outside the group.

Your participation is voluntary, and if you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at mnakai@uoregon.edu or 541-514-2781. You are also welcome to contact my faculty supervisor, Tiffany Gallicano, with questions at derville@uoregon.edu or (541) 346-2035.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office for Protection of Human Subjects, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, 541-346-2510. This Office oversees the review of the research to protect your rights and is not involved with this study.

A reply to this email with a statement that you are giving your informed consent would indicate that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received this email, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies.

In your reply, please copy and paste the following language to give consent to recordings:

I give informed consent for the conversation to be recorded on video and audio device, with the understanding that the recordings would be deleted within six months of the focus group and only Maiko Nakai would see or hear it. I further understand that I can withdraw my consent at any time.

Finally, once I identify participants, I will ask you to vote for focus group times that work for you on Doodle.

Sincerely,

Maiko Nakai
Graduate Student
School of Journalism and Communication
University of Oregon

APPENDIX F

FOCUS GROUP MODERATOR GUIDE

Questions right before or right after (for demographic purposes only)

- How many children do you have and how old are they?
- What social media tools do you use, and how often do you use them?

Welcome participants, explain why you're doing this, thank them for being there.

Grand Tour Question

1. I'd like for each person to introduce themselves to the group.

General Question

2. Generally speaking, when a company puts out an ad that offends its customers, how should it respond?

- Follow-up questions: Should it use social media?
(If not, why not?)
(If so, how should it respond on social media?)
(If so, what are best ways for a company to engage in dialogue with customers via social media?)
- *Ask questions based on respondents' answers.*

Crisis Situation

We're going to discuss a crisis situation that a company could have prevented. Raise your hand if you remember the Motrin advertising that Johnson and Johnson put out that involved wearing a baby carrier.

I'm going to show you an advertisement and we'll discuss it.

Show Motrin baby ad on YouTube: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BmykFKjNpdY>

3: What do you think about this ad?

4: If you are annoyed with the ad, what would it take to forgive them, or could you forgive them? **If no one is annoyed, skip this question.*

Backlash on Social Media

I'm going to show you several reactions that people had to this ad online.

Video with excerpts of tweets

In the first one, an angry mom, Jessica Gottlieb, responded to the ad on Twitter with a hashtag, #MotrinMoms. The single post ignited a firestorm of criticism on Twitter from

other offended moms using the same hashtag. I'm going to share a brief video clip with you that features some of the tweets:

Show 40 seconds of the YouTube video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LhR-y1N6R8Q&feature=related>

Self-video response to ad

Here's a video response to the Motrin case:

Show the video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wFcKhv5O4zM&feature=related>

Culture jamming video response

And here is another video that was posted in response to the Motrin ad:

Show the video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TpqpAGLS2t4>

Blog post

Here is an example of a blog post that a mom wrote in response to the ad.

Pass out blog handout.

Facebook groups

Two oppositional Facebook groups were set up: "Boycott Motrin," which attracted more than 1,300 people, and "Babywearing isn't painful. Boycott Motrin for saying it is," which has 1,063 fans. Here is what the second Facebook fan page looks like.

Pass out Facebook handout.

Focus Group Feedback

Put up the slide that lists moms' responses.

5. Should Johnson & Johnson have responded to the feedback it received and if so, what should it have said – if not, why did they not need to respond?

Probe: (If people think it should have responded) Should Johnson & Johnson's messages have differed at all, depending on the social media channel? (Twitter, Facebook, YouTube)

6. If you think Johnson & Johnson should have responded to the feedback it received, which social media channels should the company have used?

Probe: Should they have posted apology messages on their own social media accounts? Which ones?

*Probe: Should they have responded by posting **tweets** to the #MotrinMoms hashtag? Why or why not?*

Probe: Should they have posted a comment in response to the **serious video** that featured a mom describing her feelings about the ad? Why or why not?

Probe: Should they have posted a response to the **Boob mock ad**? Why or why not? (If they say yes): What should they have said?

Probe: Should they have posted a comment to the **blog post**? Why or why not?

Probe: Should they have posted a comment to the **Facebook groups**? Why or why not?

7. Is there one or more social media channels that the company could use that would be especially good for demonstrating that it is being honest and genuine with its response? (*Dialogic theory, commitment, genuineness dimension*)

8. If the company responded on the social media channels you mentioned, would you consider that the company was accessible during the crisis? (*Dialogic theory, propinquity, engagement*)

9. How can the company use social media to show that it has made a substantive effort to understand what moms think? (*Dialogic theory, commitment, commitment to interpretation dimension*)

10. How can Johnson & Johnson share power with moms and minimize power differences with how it responds? (*Dialogic theory, mutuality, spirit of mutual equality dimension*)

11. If Johnson & Johnson responds to some people's comments on a blog, would it then be unfair to people who they don't respond to? Is it better to respond to some or none at all? (*Dialogic theory, propinquity, temporal flow dimension*)

12. If Johnson & Johnson responds to some people's comments on a blog, how can it show that it values each person's reaction, regardless of what it is? (*Dialogic theory, risk, recognition of strange otherness dimension*)

13. How can the company demonstrate a commitment to having a good conversation with moms? (*Dialogic theory, commitment, commitment to conversation dimension*)

14. How can Johnson & Johnson's responses sound spontaneous and not scripted? (*Dialogic theory, risk, vulnerability and unanticipated consequences dimensions*)

15. How could Johnson & Johnson have involved moms in the creation of the ad before deciding to launch it as a major campaign on billboards, magazines, and online? (*Dialogic theory, propinquity, immediacy of presence dimension*)

(If this is the last question): Is there anything you'd like to add?

16. An apology was issued by Kathy Widmer who is the vice president of marketing at McNeil Consumer Healthcare, which is owned by Johnson & Johnson and is responsible for the Motrin Brand. I'm going to give you the copy of the letter that appeared on the organization's website. I'd like you to take a moment to read the letter and think about your reactions.

Kathy Widmer also sent an email that's similar to the apology letter directly to some influential bloggers. The company took down the letter, but it still exists online. Here is a copy of the letter and an example of a blog that it went to.

Distribute Motrin website posting and letter to select group of bloggers.

Johnson & Johnson did not respond via social media.

What do you think about the company's response?

Probe: What do you like about it?

Probe: What do you dislike about it and what should they have done differently?

Thank you very much for your time and insight. Is there anything you would like to add?

APPENDIX G

TRANSCRIPT OF MOTRIN AD

The following transcript comes from the Motrin ad (Johnson & Johnson, 2010).

Wearing your baby seems to be in fashion.

I mean, in theory, it's a great idea.

There's the front baby carrier, the sling, the schwing, the wrap, the pouch.

And who knows what else they've come up with. Wear your baby on your side, your front, go hands free.

Supposedly, it's a real bonding experience.

They say that babies carried close to the bod tend to cry less than others.

But what about me? Do moms that wear their babies cry more than those who don't?

I sure do!

These things put a ton of strain on your back, your neck, your shoulders.

Did I mention your back?

I mean, I'll put up with the pain because it's a good kind of pain; it's for my kid.

Plus, it totally makes me look like an official mom.

So, if look tired and crazy, people will understand why.

APPENDIX H

MCNEIL / JOHNSON & JOHNSON'S APOLOGY LETTER ON WEBSITE

Below is the apology letter Johnson & Johnson published.

With regard to the recent Motrin advertisement, we have heard you. On behalf of McNeil Consumer Healthcare and all of us who work on the Motrin Brand, please accept our sincere apology. We have heard your complaints about the ad that was featured on our website. We are parents ourselves and take feedback from moms very seriously. We are in the process of removing this ad from all media. It will, unfortunately, take a bit of time to remove it from our magazine advertising, as it is on newsstands and in distribution. Thank you for your feedback. It's very important to us.

Sincerely,

Kathy Widmer

Vice President of Marketing

McNeil Consumer Healthcare

APPENDIX I

PARENT BLOG POST WITH SAMPLE COMMENTS

This is a sample of parent blog posts and comments. The odd characters are here as they appeared in the original post.

The original print outs will be handed.

Motrin's new ad attacks babywearing, insults moms

November 15, 2008

Have you seen the new online Motrin ad? You know, the one where they attack babywearing and insult moms in an effort to sell their drugs? **Watch it** here (at least until they take it down) or it's also on YouTube.

Motrin, **WHAT WERE YOU THINKING??** Oh yeah, you weren't.

Thanks to Barb for typing out the video verbatim:

In case they pull the ad from their front page by the time you're reading this (I sure hope they trash the entire campaign, and fast), I'm quoting the little video on their website front page, which they call a "Mom-versation". The phrases in bold are my emphasis, though they have even better emphasis in the graphics in their ad.

Wearing your baby seems to be in fashion.

I mean, **in theory** it's a great idea.

There's the front baby carrier, sling, schwing, wrap, pouch.

And who knows what else they've come up with. Wear your baby on your side, your front, go hands free.

Supposedly, it's a real bonding experience.

They say that babies carried close to the bod tend to cry less than others.

But what about me? Do moms that wear their babies cry more than those who don't?

I sure do!

These things put **a ton** of strain on your back, your neck, your shoulders. Did I mention your back?!

I mean, Iâ€™ll put up with the pain because itâ€™s a good kind of pain; itâ€™s for my kid.

Plus, it totally **makes me look like an official mom.**

And so if I look tired and crazy, people will understand why.

Here’s the response I just emailed them:

Motrin’s new ad campaign targeting babywearing is offensive, disrespectful and wrong on so many levels. If a mom is experiencing significant pain from wearing her baby, then she needs to adjust her carrier/sling or try another one. Babywearing has so many proven benefits to both mom and baby and women have been wearing babies since the beginning of time. Stop disrespecting us moms, Motrin. Unlike our babies, we weren’t born yesterday and we will take our \$ elsewhere.

Personally, I LOVED wearing my kids. My favorite carrier was the Ergo, though I also really liked the Moby Wrap. I loved having them close and safe, especially out in crowds and when I wanted to be able to get around easily without lugging a stroller. Oh yeah and there was the time I was able to nurse my son hands-free while he was in the Moby and we were out for a walk in the middle of winter without taking him out into the cold. That was pretty cool. :)

Does the Motrin ad bother you? Let Motrin know what you think. Contact Motrin and then feel free to boycott them (Johnson & Johnson owns both Motrin and Tylenol). I happen to go through a lot of Ibuprofen because I get migraines on a regular basis, but I use **generic** Ibuprofen and it works just fine and is cheaper too!

Edited to add: If you weren’t on Twitter Saturday night, you missed the onslaught of comments about the Motrin ad, but Katja Presnal at Ladybug Landings summed it up nicely in the video she made including many of the Tweets in response to Motrin: Motrin Makes Moms Mad. There are even a few pics of me wearing Julian in there, and one of Ava wearing her baby doll. :) (Ava was soo happy to be included in the video. Thanks, Katja!)

Also, please check out my follow-up post: We’ve blogged and tweeted the Motrin ad. What can moms do next? And lastly, Motrin responds and removes online ad: Motrin’s email response to the onslaught of complaints over the babywearing ad

Sample Comments to This Blog Post

1. Lauren @dreamtattoo says:

Thanks for all your support on this on twitter and in the blogsphere! I'm with you FOR SURE on this one. They'll surely understand their mistake soon! For now, we'll be sure everyone is aware of what they have said/done. Here's my reply too! Comment on my page so I can link you as well! <http://instinctparenting.wordpress.com/2008/11/15/motrin-ad/>

November 15th, 2008 at 11:36 pm

2. Hip_MOM says:

Do they really actually say, "these things..." referring to actual babies? WOW. And then they have the nerve to have a woman say that wearing a baby makes her "look like an official mom."?!? Excuse me? What does an official mom actually look like? Is there a cookie cutter mold that we're all supposed to fit into?

I haven't seen the ad but I cannot possibly imagine that anyone behind the scenes is a mom, or they'd NEVER even think about using this campaign to actually try and sell something.

Good luck to them. They just bit off the hand that used to feed them.

November 16th, 2008 at 12:00 am

3. Anonymous says:

This is my favorite part:

But what about **ME**?

Yes, because as a mom it's all about you.

I literally gasped when I watched the ad.

Hey Motrin, here's a clue, we moms who baby wear might just be the kind of moms who pay enough attention to our babies to know when they might need some fever reducers. Guess what kind of fever reducer I'm not going to buy?

November 16th, 2008 at 12:20 am

4. Angela says:

OH my gosh! I went over and watched the ad myself. That is insulting. It twists things up and confuses things. Its crap plain and simple. I'll be contacting them, boycotting their otherwise fantastic products and screaming from the rooftops how insulting this is.

November 16th, 2008 at 8:59 am

5. StephanieInCA says: Wow, talk about an advertising FAIL. I'm not sure that an apology is necessary, but Motrin should definitely reexamine how they gather info on what will appeal to their target market. This reminds me of those terrible Brooke Shields VW ads that seem to mock the very women they're trying to sell to. So bizarre. November 16th, 2008 at 11:04 am

6. Sonja says:

Ahhh yes. Babywearing "official" moms look crazy and tired. IF ONLY I could stop wearing my baby! I'd lose my official title, but I'd no longer look crazy and tired.

Nice idea to insult the people you'd like to buy your product... *snort*

November 16th, 2008 at 11:51 am

7. MomsForHumor says:

Ladies, get a sense of humor. If you are offended, you are doing the right thing by passing on your opinion. However, was it really a deliberate attempt to berate babywearing moms? Don't take yourself so seriously.

Sounds like Motrin folks are already apologetic. Be nice and show your class!

November 16th, 2008 at 9:10 pm

8. Susie says:

The ad isn't very good, but I don't really get why this is upsetting to so many of you.

I wore my kid. It often hurt. But so what? Do you think people won't wear their kid because of this?

Actually, it'd be funnier if it were more absurd/mean, but they totally softened it as the end.

I just feel like I don't get the anger at all.

November 16th, 2008 at 9:15 pm

9. jen says:

wow. heated debate, huh? i can see it from both sides. for one... i LOVED wearing my girls. and if you have the RIGHT carrier...it doesn't hurt. this is a dumb excuse for a commercial! in all honesty...my kid crying and NOT in a carrier...gives me more of a headache. and it's SO not a fashion statement! yep...that's exactly why i had kids. to wear them. 'cause it looks so cool. on the other hand. there are so many pressing issues in the world. we can take offense...but then we must make it known. and i can see that plenty of people are letting the company know. and quite honestly...i think that's the most powerful and uplifting part of this debate. that women are taking a stand.

November 16th, 2008 at 10:45 pm

10. Kyle Varner says:

Wow. Did you tampon get stuck? What in the name of God is wrong with you? You're acting like a menopausal stereotype. Get over it and you'll be a lot happier.

bye.

November 17th, 2008 at 1:57 am

APPENDIX J

CULTURE JAMMING YOUTUBE VIDEO RESPONSE TO MOTRIN AD

This is a sarcastic video a member created. Notice how similar the script is to the original Motrin ad.

Getting a boob job seems to be in fashion.

I mean, in theory, it's a great idea.

There's silicone, the sling, the saline, under the boob, through the belly button, and under the arm pits.

And who knows what else they've come up with. Wear your boobs up high, to the front. Go bra free.

Supposedly, it's a real liberating experience.

They say that big, gigantic fake boobs should make moms cry less.

But what about my boobs? Do moms that get fake boobs cry less than me?

I sure hope so.

These things put a ton of strain on your back, your neck, your shoulders.

Did I mention your back?

I mean, I'll put up with the pain because it's a good kind of pain; it's for my husband.

Plus, it would totally make me look like nothing like a mom.

And so, if I look ridiculous and uncomfortable, people will understand why.

APPENDIX K

TWEETS FEATURED ON VIDEO

The following first 40 seconds of transcript comes from a video featuring tweets in response to the Motrin ad. Moms used the hashtag, #motrinmoms to unite and express their anger against Motrin.

Motrin Makes Moms Mad

KatjaPresnal: Moms! Watch the <https://www.motrin.com/> Mom-ologue ad and let me know what you think! Me: I'm all for babywearing and NO for Motrin.

JessicaGottlieb: @Karoli My baby is 7 but picking on new mothers is vile, it's as vulnerable as we will ever be and they should know better. #motrinmoms

Kikarose: Wow Motrin, way to mismarket. My sling is saving my life and has been for 15 months now. Have you tried carrying a baby all day? #motrinmoms

90210organics: Wearing your baby does not hurt your back, shoulders, or neck if done properly #motrinmoms

pantrygirl: motrin advertisers haven't done their research. #motrinmoms personally, I baby wear not for fashion & find it alleviates discomfort.

thecouponcoup: @90210organics Thanks for the TEXTsound is out. RU FREAKING KIDDING ME? So many things wrong I don't know where to start! #motrinmoms

APPENDIX L

OUTRAGED MOM YOUTUBE VIDEO RESPONSE

Here is a straight forward video response to the ad.

Motrin:

Thanks for giving me more than enough reasons to just walk away and never purchase your product again without feeling bad about it.

Um, your new ad campaign is completely irresponsible, completely misleading, and completely full of many many many reasons why you should be apologizing to babywearing mothers and mothers in general.

Um, it's disrespectful, um, and...I don't even understand how your ad campaign and ad team could have thought that this was a good idea.

You make it seem like you are trying to relate to us when actually all you are doing is patronizing us, and um, giving us reasons to take our buying power to somewhere else.

Um, there aren't any words to just describe how disturbing to us the commercial is, and I sincerely hope that you respond to the outcry, social media outcry that's happening right now.

And um issue an apology and terminate this ad campaign immediately.

Because my headaches have nothing to do with wearing my baby.

That, in fact, actually helps make me feel better. My headache right now is caused by you.

APPENDIX M

“BABYWEARING ISN’T PAINFUL. BOYCOTT MOTRIN FOR SAYING IT IS.”

Below is the copy of the first two pages of “Babywearing isn’t painful. Boycott Motrin for saying it is” Facebook group.

<https://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=46803467500&v=wall>

APPENDIX N

FOCUS GROUP TRANSCRIPTIONS

Group 1

Maiko: Again, thank you very much for being here. And this is for my master's thesis, and I'm looking at this advertisement that Johnson & Johnson put out, which you'll see pretty soon, that offended some moms. And I'm trying to come up with some strategies for PR practitioners as to what kind of social media they can use or how they can use during crises. So that's what I'm doing, and if you can introduce yourself to each other briefly, that'll be great.

A: K, I'll go. I'm A. I'm master's student in Communication and Society program, 1st year. I have a 8-year-old girl and 10-year-old boy. And what else do you want to know?

Maiko: 8-year-old boy and...

A: 8-year-old girl and 10-year-old boy.

Maiko: K. What kind of social media you use and how often?

A: Ok. I use Facebook. And I use it...probably 3 or 4 days a week. Less on the weekend when I'm hanging out with my kids. I don't use as nearly as much as I used to. And...partly because I'm just tired of it, and partly because I'm in grad school now and I'm (can't hear) anything.

Maiko: Right.

B: Hi.

Maiko: Hi, B. Thank you so much for coming.

B: Sure. I had to work a little later, so. Sorry about that.

Maiko: That's ok. We're just introducing to each other right now.

B: Ok.

A: I think that's it. I don't use any other social media.

Maiko: Just Facebook.

A: Just Facebook. Yeah, we're all recording. Just so you know. No no no you're supposed to talk!

B: I'm spoken. (?)

A: I don't know Maiko makes the rules.

C: I'm C. I have 6-year-old and 9-year-old, both boys.

Maiko: And what kind of social media do you use?

C: Facebook. You know what I'm on.

Maiko: YouTube? YouTube?

C: No, not very often actually. I'll watch when someone sends me a link.

Maiko: And do you check Facebook every day?

C: No...I'd say every other day, maybe.

Maiko: Alright. D?

D: I'm D. I have a 8-month-old daughter. She's here. F. Haha. I'm a visiting instructor at the J-school. And I use Facebook, pretty much every day. I hadn't used so much and I became a mom and I was like "Wooo!" Haha. Um. And yea, I use it pretty much every day.

Maiko: And B... nice to meet you by the way.

B: Nice to meet you. And, so for the microphone, B. So the question was how much you use social media?

Maiko: Yeah. And about your kids, and maybe how old they are.

B: Oh, I have one daughter who is 7 and a half-year-old. She'll be 8 in June.

Maiko: Ok.

B: And I use social media every day personally, but also I manage...I've been managing for couple of different companies and organizations for the past few years. But uh personally, I use it every day...kind of...kind of a tool, as an extension of my freelance business and personal connections in a small town.

Maiko: Great. So, generally speaking, when a company puts out an ad that offends some people, how should it respond? Should it use social media?

A: Where did the ad come out?

Maiko: Just generally. Maybe online, maybe in print. How should it respond? So, either use social media or not...or any other way.

A: Hm. I would think if it's on social media. It probably would be a good place for...at least a link to apology or a link to acknowledgement, or a link to explanation or something.

C: It would depend on where the advertisement was made. And if they're going to do some kind of a counter, they have to do at the same place to try to get the same people.

Maiko: Alright. Anything else?

B: Well, my peer side comes out because not all the advertisements should be apologized for just because they offend some people. I think that's going to happen forever. I mean, I don't know, for the marketing work I do, what can I do for a non-profit organization that serves low-income people. There's medical insurance... people always find a way to object to something that we are doing. Is it one out of a lot? Or is it...one out of...whatever kind...what does it constitute in terms of the base of the folks who are responding. Is it a misstep? Or is it just a part of who they are and you know, when the GAP proposed to its logo, the (Buhaha?) was tremendous, and that led to a lot of change. But there're...I mean I think companies sometime don't have responsibility to apologize because you always offend somebody.

Maiko: Right. So whether or not a company should apologize depends on how many people it offended...you're suggesting? What other criteria or considerations would you make?

B: I think it's...I think...I think it's important to listen to what the conversation is out there. So social media allows companies to put their ears to the conversations that're happening because Twitter and Facebook are instantaneous. You know, people are being around the clock, so it allows them to really understand what the conversation and whether or not they need to insert themselves into it. And sometime, it's no. I mean, it's just...and sometime there's a place to respond and they need to have people who are monitor social media to know what the conversation to know whether or not to respond or there's an appropriate response.

Maiko: Ok. D?

D: I was going to say, I'm not sure if apology per se is necessary but the beauty of social media is that they can be a part of conversation, and not only to know what people are saying but to participate in it. I think that that alone kind of bridges that gap that people were offended about. Because obviously, there're some sort of the rift that some people didn't understand about. And that's why they made a mistake in the first place, but that's what social media can do to (can't hear) that rift on that back side, better to do on the front side, and not have to do the back side. But yeah, conversation is what's the most important thing.

B: It gives them the opportunity to respond almost immediately. And I get that all the time with the organizations I work with. Because one individuals...there's always a way to respond. And they need to part of that response. Even if it's not yet...like you said, an apology...but it allows them, that firm to respond, and why not use that opportunity.

A: I think it takes the wind out of sails sometime with people that are upset, if somebody just says, "Hey, that's interesting response! We didn't know you were going to have that response." Just even acknowledging it that there's something is going on would calm people. "Ok, they're acknowledging that I'm here."

D: They've heard me. Isn't it true in all of the personal relationships, right? I'm mad. And just telling you that I'm mad. And you know that I'm mad goes the long way to making me not mad.

Maiko: Well, the apology thing is interesting, and I hope that I can ask you some questions about that later if we have time. So, now I'm going to show you the advertisement that Johnson & Johnson put out a few years ago. This offended some moms. How many people have seen this ad? Motrin ad about baby carriers. Ok, none of you. Great, so here you go.

Showing Motrin ad

OC: B – Ugh! at "Supposedly" line
People laughing.

Maiko: So, what do you think about this ad?

D: I can see why exactly why people got pissed off. You don't piss off the baby carriers.

B: I mean, god!

C: What was the point, too? I just don't know.

A: It was pretty patronizing towards people who believe in baby carrying. Those people are very outspoken, very admin about why they believe in what they believe. I was one of those moms. I believed in baby carrying, one more than the other one because that's what I wanted to do. It does hurt your back, that's true.

OC: People laugh.

A: But it also creates bonding in a way that, you know, I mean those who use strollers all the time may not. I just think it was really condescending and patronizing and sort of polarizing.

B: Yeah, yeah.

OC: SM backlash (e.g., angry mom video), as well as other moms in other focus groups also used the word “condescending” and “patronizing” to describe the ad.

A: It surprises me that it got passed.

C: It used the word “tired and crazy.” Do I look tired and crazy? That word got me. I’m surprised that they called someone crazy. You know?

Maiko: Did you use sling?

C: No I didn’t.

Maiko: But those words...

C: Yeah I can’t believe they would say that.

A: They said moms who carry babies cry less than other moms, I sure do. That was another thing that I thought was...judgmental.

E arrives late.

E: Hi, sorry I’m late.

Maiko: That’s ok. Thanks for coming. What do you think? Should we play again so that E can participate? I’ll play again. E, this is an ad at stake so I wanted to make sure people see it.

E: Yeah, thank you.

Play again

Maiko: What do you think?

E: It’s like...that’s really judgmental tone...regardless of what they’re trying to sell.

OC: Second person who used “judgmental.”

E: It strikes me as...you know...

Maiko: This is by the way by Johnson & Johnson.

E: Yeah, I mean, it sounds like they have something against baby wearing.

A: So they used the word, “they”...What else they come up with? They used “supposedly.”

B: I know, I know, that one.

OC: “Supposedly” really got people.

A: And it makes me look official mom so I’ll do it, as if there’s no other reason. If it’s the only reason, who says that?

C: Doesn’t having a baby make you an official mom?

OC: People laughed.

Maiko: So obviously people are offended or at least annoyed. What would it take to forgive them, or can you forgive them?

C: Forgive?

D: Well, I don’t know, I wasn’t like deeply offended. I was definitely put off. But the thing that bothered me the most was sort of how off-based it was, whether or not you were proponent of baby carrying. Like if you were a baby carrier, you are not going to be anti...you are not going to be so against baby carrying. And if you are not at all baby carrying, then the ad is not so relevant to you unless like... yeah it kind of set that tone of being against baby carriers. But it doesn't seem like a bad ad to me.

A: But there’s that some sort of grudging “Ok, I’ll wear baby carrier. These are the best things because they really are for me...”

E: I have to say though I understand what they are going for. There’s something about taking care of yourself. You know, once you become a mom, that message makes sense to me, but the way they did it, it just totally messed it. I think that they could’ve done that much better in a way that wasn’t so irritating.

Maiko: Ok, so...

B: I just want to say you know, I really don’t like ads when what they are trying to do is when they take on a tone. They really are supposed to show me something. I’m thinking where’s research on this? Everything, pretty much everything in the ad it says, actually has contrary information against...contrary is against, but it doesn't hold that. The idea of good advertising is it is what at least educates ourselves. And Mortin is a good product. You know? I remember first discovery when I was teenager or something. I was like, wow, this is different. So to take on something indiscriminately to me damages what they’re trying to do to establish the product as the one you really want to take on. It really is against that.

Maiko: Thank you for the insight.

D: Oh, I just wanted to say, you mentioned a good point, (E), which is what I've been so needing(?) right now, which is how do I take care of me and take care of this baby. I imagine that never ends. So as a mom, to have that conversation...that really is what this is about.

A: That's what I envisioned. I envisioned a different ad in my head. So, ad about taking care of yourself, how good to support a baby and it's really wonderful and it's great bonding experience and sometime your back hurts but look, we have this great product that might help you, and I think it couldn't been done in a very different way.

D: Kind of like insider, you know? You carrying your baby all day and your back hurts and everyone is like in on it.

B: Instead of dividing women into the choices they are making. It's the worst tactic you can ever take with women. Women will do this. You know, the whole birth control that's going on right now. It's brought women together in so many ways because it's like "Don't mess with us." To conquer and divide, that doesn't work with women, I think.

Maiko: Ok, thank you for all your comments. So, I'm going to show you all the social media backlash all at once. So if you can remember or take notes, that'll be great. First one is tweets. One angry mom tweeted using #MotrinMoms. Hashtag is this mark (wrote # on the white board), and everyone else used the same hashtag in their tweets. Someone complied this video of those tweets, and I'll show you the first 40 seconds of it.

Show the Tweet video

Maiko: Ok, so the next one is another video that's more serious.

Show the outrageous mom video

OC: B and A laughed.

Maiko: Here's the next one. This is a cultural jamming video.

Show the video.

Maiko: The next is an example of a blog post and some sample comments to the post. If you can take a look at it...

Hand print-outs

Maiko: Did you all kind of get the idea of what people had to say?

Everyone nodded.

Maiko: Ok, lastly, two oppositional Facebook groups were set up. One was called “Boycott Motrin,” which attracted more than 1,300 people, and the other one was called “Babywearing isn’t painful. Boycott Motrin for saying it is.” And this is a print-out of the second group. First one is no longer there. So if you can also take a look at it...

Hand print-outs.

B: Omg.

A: It looks like it became the place for other things as well. People are advertising like service...like, “here’s my number.”

Maiko: So, this is a list of all the social media backlash we just saw. My first question is: Should Johnson & Johnson have responded to the feedback it received? If so, why, if not, why should it not have responded?

D: I think it definitely needed to respond.

Maiko: How come?

D: I mean...start from the beginning, their attention was totally, I mean...they didn’t intend to polarize the people or make people mad, so. Fail. So they obviously needed to respond to that. And yeah, they really touched a pretty huge nerve. And I think that it would be dawn (?) from business standpoint to not respond.

Maiko: Does everyone agree with that?

Everyone says yes.

C: Yeah I mean, it was the main group they were focusing the ad on. Otherwise, they wouldn’t say it’s your back, your front holding the sling, so the main target group was offended, so they had to respond to that.

Maiko: So I guess everyone agreed on that. But then should Johnson & Johnson’s message have differed at all depending on social media channels like Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, blog?

A: It sounds like responses are the same across the board. It doesn’t seem like things are much different on Twitter than they are on other places unless I’m not reading that right. So I don’t think responses need to be different, as long as there’s some kind of response.

Maiko: Agreed everyone? B?

B: I guess I’m not sure what you mean by...different message on different places?

Maiko: Yeah different messages depending on social media channels. The way they respond, actual words they use, I don't know, whatever it means to you. Different message the organization could've sent.

E: I can see like using different media strategy, not necessarily different message. You know, say engaging or re-engage the audience that might be alienated...you know, "tell us your good babywearing story!" or you know something like that. Seems like with social media, you can re-engage with audience that was just alienated.

D: Or you know, they may make another mock-mock ad to kind of come back their original ad, or you know, kind of like make it right.

Maiko: Oh so Johnson & Johnson could make another cultural jamming video against...the boob one?

D: I mean...if that's what they wanted to do. Or you can create some sort of video and put it on YouTube. You know, whatever.

Maiko: Ok.

C: The only reason why I would see that you want to do a different one was, say, the tweets were all on "we are offended" and Facebook one was all on not pain-related. So if it's holding to one core...each of (can't hear) separated, then you want to address issue on the certain one.

Maiko: Sure.

A: But wouldn't just social media inherently require...at least slightly different ways, because Twitter only gives 140 characters, so you can't exactly do the same thing than you do...I mean you can run a full lot of campaign, and on Facebook, they can start their own page, and they go say, you know, yeah post your stories or make a video of yourself wearing a baby and post it and they could have made their own video using those, they could've done on Facebook...I think that they have a lot more options.

B: Yeah, probably what they need to do is a full, established response in a blog or on their web page and they probably need to insert themselves into the Twitter and into the Twitter conversation and just refer back to that so that people...because I don't think there's a way...140 characters to respond to everything that's going on, but if they are collecting information and figuring out overall these are the top 10 things we want to respond to, so let's do it in a video response that we can put on YouTube, let's respond on a blog, let's respond with facts (?) and step by step thing and start repeating that it's available to see in the Twitter world, because I don't think they can respond to everything. It goes too fast and furious but if they have an established response in a video and online then you can refer back to that at any time.

D: Yeah, and if they're trying to have a conversation, like rigid, conversation on the nerve that was touched then probably Twitter isn't the best place for that.

Maiko: Yeah, ok, thank you. So, if you think Johnson & Johnson should have responded, which you do, which social media channels should the company have used? You kind of mentioned it already but should they have used their own social media accounts?

A: You mean their own Facebook page?

Maiko: Sure, on their website, Twitter account...

E: Yeah seems like it's a good idea to post on their social media accounts and refer back to them.

B: Because seems like at one point, they have to decide which one are they really going to respond to and let the rest go. And so even on their Facebook site, the first hit was here, the intro form, which would be different from when they have more long form of blog. Here're the five responses, ok, let's hear and let's keep on monitoring what the conversation is. Here're another five, more recent things. Because there're so many things you know, they (can't hear) thousands every day so I just think if they monitor and give good general response every once in a while to show they want to be part of conversation and that aren't opting out...

Maiko: Sure. So say on Twitter, people used the same hashtag, and so many tweets were generated but you just said it's impossible to respond to each single thing. Does anyone has anything add on that?

A: I think if any cohesive conversation, it's important not to respond to every single thing. I think, like she said, you need to have consistent message. People are posting such different things. Who's job is that going to be? Who's monitoring all that if multiple people are responding to that? It just doesn't really...it could make it worse. If they have one consistent message and they keep linking back to that, or if they open their own blog just for that on their webpage, which you can post as many responses as necessary, then they can collect them and they can respond them that way. But it doesn't seem like it's a smart thing to respond to every single thing.

Maiko: I see.

D: That would make sense to me. Like "Ok yeah we have created this blog. Let's talk about the issue. This is really important" so that you can kind of direct people to one place so that you can get more head lined (?) but then I wonder that would alienate people who are like "hold on, we started this thing on Twitter and now you want us to go to your blog?"

A: Right.

D: Collecting information? I don't know...I...

E: I think you could do something like, "We're sorry!" you know? Just put it out there, you know? and it doesn't take 140 characters.

Maiko: Uh-huh. What about the serious video response of this mom describing her feelings toward the ad? Should Johnson & Johnson have responded to the video by commenting?

B: No...

A: I think, to me, who's having been there in business for a long time, I tend to not respond to individual criticisms, and like I said, try to be consistent. She wasn't saying anything different than anybody else said. She just used a video to say it. So, I think it would be ok for them to go there and say "thank you for your feedback. Here's the link to our website where we have some information about it" or something like that.

B: And you know, yeah, if it's the one that got the most hits, then they can even say well, this is the one that got us most thinking. I mean, the best PR is honest conversations with the audience. It's not pondering to them. And that's why BP got such a problem because they weren't actually talking to them. So if they think they messed up or whatever they want to say, wow this is one that got us talking, if they want to go to a place that people are responding the most. On YouTube, they can monitor the number of hits, so if this is the one that has 1.2 million hits or whatever, you know, that's the one that people are looking at more so that's the one you probably have to marshal their energy to figure out where they're going to be the most effective to comment.

Maiko: Yeah, great. What about the boob one? Should Johnson & Johnson have responded, if so, what should it have said?

E: I don't think they needed to respond to that. It was a joke. It was like...I don't know...I think it goes backwards to respond to that.

D: It's not furthering the conversation in any way. It was a funny, parody and It's got the ridiculousness of the emotion behind the original ad but the video was reaction. You know, reaction to the reaction is horrible.

A: I think you know, in some ways, the video kind of helped by getting some frustration out of it and making other people just say "have fun."

Maiko: Ah-huh. Why do you not want to react to reaction, D?

D: Because I think that the nerve that was touched was what needs to be discussed. And this was kind of a spin-off of that. It got at...you know, you (can't hear) some words and you could see how it was offensive so it was totally useful to point them out. Yeah, the

discussion is about balancing self and motherhood, and physical challenges of being a mom, and yeah, just being part of a community. I think you want to keep it towards that sort of more positive and useful.

B: And I think...I mean if you think of it as if they were responding to the Saturday Night Live, and Saturday Night does something and they mock something and that's popular culture, do you really thin it's necessary to respond to that? Probably not so it's just beyond what's necessary.

OC: People laugh

Maiko: Haha ok. What about the blog post? Should Johnson & Johnson have responded to that? Why or why not?

D: Was it a really a well-viewed blog post?

Maiko: Well, this blog post that we read. One of the most angry moms wrote it and people commented on it.

B: How many people really saw this? Again, it's about where you are going...I think it's about where you are going to lighten the conversation, and if this is where folks are going, then yeah you need to respond. And if not, then not necessary.

E: Again, if we had a central place to go for response, then...these people have all kinds of message, so they aren't just copying and pasting in here and saying this is what they are saying back, unless they are asking people to post on their blog and they are not doing it, or talking somewhere else, that might be a reason to respond but...

D: There always tends to something that surfaces where everyone goes, the link that gets passed around. And of course, there're conversations at bunch of different places. But there's usually one main place and that's where you respond, rather than a random lady blog who mentions it.

Maiko: Ok, what about the Facebook group?

C: No, doesn't seem like it's necessary. They're just random things.

E: Yeah doesn't seem like it. Yeah, just waste of time.

C: Also, if the whole story dies down, then let it die down and it'll go away on its own. But if it's still peaking, then if it's stirring, then they need to do something, but if it's gone over the hump and staring to go down with what they've already done then let it go and just watch.

Maiko: Would you agree, B, to not respond to Facebook?

B: Oh yeah.

Maiko: Alright. So now, is there one or more social media channels that the company could use that would be especially good for demonstrating that it is being honest and genuine with its response?

A: You mean one social media sort of make you seem honest than others?

Maiko: Yeah.

A: I don't think Twitter so...I can't really compare.

B: Well, when you say Twitter...Twitter is news feed of a kind. They are conversations but not like others. It just doesn't...I'm not sure necessary...unless what they want to unfold the series of actions that they are taking, which is what Twitter would be good for updating, but creating a response on Twitter...

A: Like counter campaigns or something like that?

B: Or if they want to take control and say...you know, start from the very beginning, of where you started, we've heard your responses. Here's what we're doing next. Now we've convened this group. We've got a group of moms together. I don't know...to actually let the public know what they are doing step by step so that public follows them on Twitter, which wouldn't necessarily work as well on Facebook. But it would work really nice on Twitter. Facebook is more of conversation site but Twitter is more...

OC: That's a great idea to use Twitter to show the series of actions the organization is taking to fix the problem.

A: And the posts get lost quickly, but don't tweets stay on Twitter?

Maiko: Yeah.

B: And it could be associated with a hashtag too. So you know, it would be...people could comment on there, but they are still be able to say, well, yeah ok, and respond to the way they did. So Twitter would be good more in a play of crisis communications, and each additional one is more established for a longer form of communicating with the public...Facebook, blog and then YouTube definitely. Then video ad.

Maiko: Would you say YouTube would be most effective because of visual or whatever?

B: Not necessarily.

E: As a consumer, I have to say when I see a business or money-making venture posting anything on YouTube or any of the platforms, I mean, yeah, really any of them, I don't...honesty isn't the main thing that I commonly have felt with.

Maiko: Ok. If the company responded on the social media channels you mentioned, would you consider that the company was accessible during the crisis?

A: I guess it depends on how they responded. If it took them a week then no. If it's within a day or two, that would make me think they were accessible.

Maiko: Ok, anything else?

B: I think it would be accessible if the way of writing created a loop, open loop, so if they write it in a way where everything is a closed book, then they shut down the conversations. But if they provide the forum or place to comment, then they would be more open. So I'm not sure if it necessarily has to do with a particular channel but how they position themselves.

Maiko: I see.

D: I think they would be accessible but I'd be cynical about the access. Oh, where were you? And whatever whatever. But I would think they're being accessible at necessity.

OC: Interesting comment about cynicism.

Maiko: OK, great, C, do you have anything to add?

C: I would personally prefer on their website over others.

Maiko: Why is that?

C: Because the other ones, I don't know what kind of virus I may get. It's just...like you said, you just don't trust their stuff. Who's posting it. It might not have to do anything to do with Johnson & Johnson. But with the website, you can at least control what's being hosted by them. And so I think I would have more faith in what they are putting on their actual website as being actually from them and what's being tried to come across.

Maiko: I see. Great. How can the company use social media to show that it has made a substantive effort to understand what moms think?

D: If they understand exactly...like...again the nerve they touched...if it's clear...like it's the same in a personal relationship, if someone apologized but not for the thing that you're mad at, then you get even more mad because people didn't hear me. So I think that makes sort of thing makes sense. And being genuine.

E: I think that it's doubly tricky too, because...I don't know, I get kind of meft (?)...I feel like I'm being used for market research even though that's what Facebook is for, but when I feel like I'm overtly used...but at the same time, I do think saying something like "tell us about baby wearing," "how did this change your life?" or whatever, that could

potentially being much more engaging and you know, people feel a company is being more responsible.

B: I think that they need to invite a group of women, sit down and film it with the Johnson & Johnson folks, and put it out there and show their responses and they have to be honest. I mean they have to show that they are connecting with women. And I'd say that they probably would want to bring their team together and talk about how they do that and even put it out to the women, "so how do we bring you back to the conversations?" or you know, I haven't worked for a big firm before so not exactly sure but they would want to invite women to the company and not just in a digital world but like...

Maiko: I see, interesting.

A: That's what news show, you know, they invite the most vocal people who may have opposing opinions and have a forum and discuss it. They could seek out to make a video or like the woman who made the Facebook page...sort of leaders...and have conversations.

D: One thing that I think might be cool is that if they got a group of vocal people together, real moms, real women, because there're a plenty of pain that's associated with motherhood that does not come from babywearing. So if they come up with a follow-up commercial ad that's really well done, and really on-point, and took into account all, you know, all that reality, and that I think would be a cool response because that works for everyone. It works for the company because they get a great ad, and they get to say that they really responded well, and all the women would feel like they are heard, and there's an ad there that might speak to other people.

Maiko: That's an interesting idea. I didn't even think about that. Thank you all. So, How can Johnson & Johnson share power with moms and minimize power differences with how it responds?

B: I think that's what we've been talking about.

Maiko: So, meeting people, getting people together, would that minimize the power difference between the organization and the public?

D: I think social media itself minimizes the power difference. I mean that's why it is what it is.

A: And even, certainly the acknowledgment of what they did offended people would minimize the power difference as well. You know, we acknowledge that audiences have power and they aren't saying whatever.

Maiko: If Johnson & Johnson responds to some people's comments on a blog, would it then be unfair to people who they don't respond to? Is it better to respond to some or none at all?

B: Definitely better to respond some.

D: If they respond to where the conversations are happening, then their responses are going to...you know, people are going to send out the link to that response.

A: They make it respond by posting their own response as opposed to posting their response to the individual postings might be more diplomatic.

Maiko: You mean response to the main, original...

A: Like you put it on Facebook and make it own posting instead of responding to individual...

Maiko: Ah I see.

A: Or these are the main points we're going to respond to, as opposed to...

Maiko: I get it, yeah individually responding. Anything to add to that?

D: I'm sitting here thinking they can make a commercial about five pains from bouncing...I just keep thinking...

E: Yeah seriously, all of the things that...sleep deprivation...you know, start a Facebook and say, "what are you using Motrin for?" Honestly, that would get them free...free focus groups.

OC: Another good idea.

OC: People laugh

E: I want to tell you.

C: Samples of Motrin if you respond...

A: First time to comment or make suggestions...there're all sorts of things they can do to create a good will.

Maiko: Ok, next question is, if Johnson & Johnson responds to some people's comments on a blog, how can it show that it values each person's reaction, regardless of what it is?

B: I don't think that's possible.

Maiko: Why not?

B: Do everybody's response?

Maiko: Each person's reaction.

E: It seems like there're major themes. So they could say, "a lot of you are concerned about this, a lot of you are concerned about this." There're definitely still be some people who are irritated by this, regardless.

D: Yeah, there're always people who are irritated by each little thing.

Maiko: How can the company demonstrate a commitment to having a good conversation with moms?

A: Engagement and acknowledgement.

C: At one point, they want to wrap it up. They don't want a conversation that continues. They are going to want to wrap and move on.

Maiko: Ok, then how can Johnson & Johnson's responses sound spontaneous and not scripted?

B: I don't know if it's possible.

C: They have to have a script because it needs to direct what the biggest points are without countering...they don't want to look like talking two sides. And so they have to have a set of what they have to say.

A: Why would you not want to be scripted?

Maiko: I don't know, what do you think?

A: I can see especially in particular...sort of...people who probably had the most strong reactions or probably anti-corporate people, that's just my personal experience, they are going to be accusing of having it scripted no matter what. But I think it has to be pretty scripted...it could have some levels and change up a little bit but they have to decide what they're going to say so.

D: It'll be worse if they have to re-offend people in a different way.

Maiko: But if it's scripted then it might not sound genuine.

A: They just need to work hard on it.

C: Make a genuine script.

Maiko: How would you do that?

A: Get really really good people.

D: Get someone who's sympathetic to the cause to script it.

E: Hire like a creative moby or key baby-wearing advocates or something like that?

A: Organizations that make them or...they can even take responses from women and incorporate them to the script if they really want to make it...but...

Maiko: B, do you have anything to add?

B: I don't know...I think what they need to just show is that there're going to be some kind of actions in reaction to this and not just words. And that's what's important. And I'm trying to think of how I can give examples but I would probably have to brainstorm with a whole bunch of people on this problem. But what would be the actions that they actually could take as a company to show that there's going to be shift, change. Actions that're meaningful. So that's why...but I don't know exactly what that is, but there's going to be a script, information but then action. So I think some actions are going to be...it's going to resonate with women. And they probably do a focus group and have bunch of people coming in...bring women to understand what it is. But I think actions are what people are going to respond to and not just information.

OC: Corrective action.

C: Like pulling the ad?

B: Yeah, I'm not sure, maybe. Wasn't really sure, but I'm thinking what would make me think, ok, there's some movement here.

Maiko: Ok, great comment. How could Johnson & Johnson have involved moms in the creation of the ad before deciding to launch it as a major campaign on billboards, magazines, and online?

A: Well, they would have had to realize that they were heading down the path to offend people, because I don't know how many large corporations actually include people's opinions but...you know, we thought we were being funny but we didn't know...you know, we thought we were talking to people...we were all together...so, you have to first know you are about to offend people before you are about to offend people.

B: I mean, did they do any research?

Maiko: How should they do that?

B: Just google it.

C: It's a large company. They could have, when the ad was all set to go...

D: Yeah, show that and ask, "hey, what do you think about the ad?"

C: And they would have got "well, maybe you should talk to B" or...left out...and they could've edited it. And they wouldn't have made such an explosion when it hit.

B: I'm not necessarily saying boycott was the thing came to my mind because that's kind of an extreme action, and that's not necessarily poisoning babies in another country. But I do think that...

A: Did they even have any women review this? Because I mean, it's such a common thing to...where did they get this information to even come up with this idea? Was it a bunch of men sitting around?

B: It's not even high production...It couldn't have show it...It doesn't cost much to...

A: I know! And it's a big company.

E: I think a lot of the things we've talked about...addressing things...mistakes they could have...

Maiko: Can I quickly distribute this? This is the actual apology they distributed on their website and response to a personal email from a mom.

A: Ah I was wondering...How quickly did she respond, you know?

Maiko: Took quite a while.

A: It took quite a while since she sent this to get one back?

Maiko: Right.

A: Swift action..."We're in the process of removing this ad"...how long would that take?

OC: People laugh

A: 30 seconds?

Maiko: If you notice, two are very very similar.

A: Yeah scripted.

E: But it is signed by the same person so it doesn't strike me as terribly weird.

D: I mean that seems like a shut-down.

OC: People agree

A: To me, it's good to get the conversation going...I mean just sorry we offended, this is what we meant to do, we're going to take it down. But don't get mad if it's still out there because we can't take it down quickly.

E: It might have made a difference...I myself a mom with three daughters...here you go.

D: It seems to treat that the problem is that the ad keeps being seen, and not the sentiment behind the ad.

Maiko: Is there anything you like about the ad?

B: No.

E: I think it's fine. It's a little canned.

A: It's a little corporate.

D: But I mean if she truly is a person that's in charged, and truly is a mom of three daughters, I mean, that'll be framed better than you know, 25-year-old guy.

C: And it doesn't really fit. The appreciation for all the parents do for the babies...it doesn't really fit with the ad.

E: Yeah attitude for letter.

Maiko: Ok, attitude is the problem.

A: Did they post anything on social media?

Maiko: No, this is the only thing they did. They didn't respond to Facebook, they didn't respond to Twitter, they didn't respond to blog...just a few personal emails and apology on the company website.

OC: People "ugh..." sound shocked

A: Which was...this was company apology?

Maiko: Right.

D: That response feels (can't hear) touched. It's not just sentiment behind it but the way you respond today seems old school.

B: There aren't really warmth to it. I mean, there can be.

E: Especially because the ad was so sassy.

D: "I'm talking to you, just you!" Hahaha.

E: Turn on a little bit of that. "We're best friends!" – that's little better.

B: Yeah, as if you were talking to women. It's so touch-down, corporate tone.

Maiko: Well, thank you so very much for coming here and for all your comments.

Group 2

Maiko: First of all, thank you so much for being here. This is for my master's thesis and I'm looking at this particular ad that Johnson & Johnson put out a few years ago that offended some mom. I would like to get some reactions from you toward the ad to contribute to strategies for PR professionals as to what they should do using social media during crises. So if you can introduce yourself, including name, when's your baby due, what kind of social media you use...Facebook, Twitter, blog, YouTube etc. and how often you use them, that would be great.

G: I'm G. And I'm due next Friday, the 27th. For social media...

Maiko: Facebook?

G: Yeah, Facebook. Ugh...

Maiko: How often do you check?

G: Every day.

Maiko: How many times?

G: Sometimes long time.

H: I'm H. I'm due May...August 19th. I use Facebook also, but I'm also using my own language site (can't hear)

Maiko: What's that called?

H: Mayo (?)

Maiko: Mayo?

H: It's in Russian so it's easy to understand.

Maiko: Sure. How often do you use it?

H: Every day.

I: My name is I. I'm due August 4th. It's going to be my first child, our first child. I use Internet every day, I use Facebook.

Maiko: What? You're on Facebook?!

I: I'm on Facebook. I don't use it very much. I use it as opinion leaders, just opinion leaders. I don't post too much, and just...what I'm interested in...people usually are interested in the same thing as I am. I look every day, once or twice.

Maiko: But we still need to be friends.

I: Yeah, you are not going to find me. But yeah.

Maiko: Haha, ok, great.

J: My name is J. My due is the same as G's...August 27th. I use Facebook. I just use Facebook. But other than that, I do (can't hear) and Google. I just see that image.

Maiko: And you don't do or post anything.

I: I don't post anything. Other than that, you know, I use Gmail, news and blogs.

Maiko: I see. Company blogs or people blogs?

I: People blogs.

Maiko: Ok. K?

K: I'm K. I'm due June 15th. This will be the first time, (can't hear) I'm having twins. (can't hear) I use Facebook. I'm on probably more than I'm supposed to. (can't hear) I probably spend four hours on the phone checking.

Maiko: I'm the same way, I'm always on. Ok, so generally speaking, when a company puts out an ad that offends some people, how should it respond? The company. Should they use social media or not? What kind of message they send out?

I: Why should they?

Maiko: How should they?

I: In my opinion, they can do whatever they want. And I'm going to laugh at whatever I want. So if they want to put it out there, put it out there.

Maiko: But when an ad offends some people, how should the company respond?

K: They should definitely respond if people actually felt (can't hear) about it. If an ad offends some people, (can't hear), they are going to lose customers. They should respond somehow. They should apologize, depending (can't hear) change the ad...

Maiko: Right. When they respond though, should they use traditional media, you know? Like newspaper, advertisement, that kind of stuff, TV, print-media, or do you think it's more effective if they used social media and other means?

I: It could be more effective if they personally apologize.

J: The thing is that if someone is not already offended by that advertisement, you know, that kind of attention? You know, if someone is personal like some advertisement...I (can't hear), you know, it's just for sales purpose. Some people may not be offended. So if you're good, I did something, and this offends some people, I, they also...make...like anything for me to observe... "is this offending?" or something like that...so I mean, in a way, it also may seem advertising as sales strategy. If you don't know something, and you know by that advertisement. So, it's a choice that they should make. At the beginning, like when they use any kind of advertisement, they should consider if it offends people or not...but later comes (can't hear)

OC: Interesting comment about using offensive ad works as strategy. It's sometimes hard to understand what they are saying because of their accents or English ability so maybe I should summarize the ad later...

Maiko: Ok, anything to add?

G: I think she's right. I've experienced that in my country, actually. There was a movie actually and then there was a talking the games, they were Muslims, and the way they go about their pray, and there was someone who was abusive in the play. And the Muslims were angry and this producer actually comes out and say, "Oh I'm sorry" and blah blah blah. And that actually made the movie popular. Everyone wanted to watch the movie, and you know, see why you know, the Muslims were angry. I think there was an advert (?)...and actually has problem. I don't think it's a right thing to come on TV and say "Oh we are sorry" and blah blah blah. But the next thing to do is to take the ad off, just take it off the TV, and do a different ad. When everyone sees that, they know that moms offend. But no matter what, audience will be angry. That is not going to change. Actually, no matter what they do.

OC: Right, any ad could potentially offend someone.

I: You probably meant which channels should they use.

Maiko: Right, do you think they should use social media to respond?

H: They can probably use famous channels or famous journal or blog people see often.

I: Maybe it depends on who they want to reach.

Maiko: Ok. I'm going to show you this ad at stake. It was a Motrin ad and it was put online, in magazines.

Play the ad.

Maiko: That was it. Did you understand? So it's like you get all these pains by wearing babies in slings. And here's a Motrin product to kill your pain. And it kind of made fun of those moms who are wearing their babies. So what do you think about this ad?

I: (can't hear) You have to decide whether or not you want to use pain-killer. So if you are against pain-killer, then you are not going to use it. But if you are in favor, you use it.

OC: But that's not the real issue here...

Maiko: What do you think about the ad itself that offended some moms?

J: I don't know what the ad

Maiko: Should we watch it again?

J: Is it about baby carrying or is it about...

I: It's about painkillers you should use when you use baby carrier, right?

Maiko: Right, but...

G: Pain that mothers go through...

J: I mean, who made this ad?

Maiko: Johnson & Johnson. Yeah and the point is...

G: What's the purpose of this ad? What was the product of this ad?

Maiko: Motrin. Pain killer like Tylenol or you know, those kind of pain killer.

G: Oh ok. But this ad is about pain killer...

I: The funny thing is that Johnson & Johnson did it. They do baby shampoo, baby soap, you know...baby lotion...

J: But this ad is about pain killer.

Maiko: Well, yes but the way they did that...for example, it called those moms crazy, and you know, they wear babies because they want to look official, and like, supposedly it's a bonding experience.

I: I don't see why people should be offended.

Maiko: Ok, so you don't understand why people...ok, that's a good comment. What do you think, K?

K: I kind of get it. I think I would be offended seeing this ad. My cousin and I were talking this weekend, and her baby is 5-month-old, and weighs 19 lbs and she wears the baby and sure she gets backache, but she wants to be close to the baby. (can't hear) And she can't sit up and (can't hear) so she doesn't really have any other choice. I think she would be offended. It makes it sound like she's doing it because people will perceive it well and not because it's the best thing for her and baby.

Maiko: Yeah...right. So, do you want to see it again?

Play the ad again

Maiko: Any comments to add about this ad? (Initial) I wasn't offended, K was sort of offended? Or you would be offended.

K: Yeah, it just make it sound like you are doing it to get someone else's attention. (can't hear) Plus I hate ads that people can't get what the ad is for.

OC: People laugh

Maiko: Ok.

G: I don't like ads that are condemned and...you heard the line of "what else do they come up with?" (can't hear) If you want to sell it, sell it, and don't try to talk against someone...the other thing is that like, I'm wearing it because I want others to see...but the main reason why I wear that is not because others would see it but because (can't hear)

Maiko: Yeah, like part of you.

G: Yeah. So for me, I'm not really...the point is I'm not really offended. Sometimes I watch ads I don't know what it is. So those things mean a lot here, in here.

H: Was that ad...pain...

I: Pain-killer.

H: Pain killer. I think that it's a bad advertisement. About moms? They should think, "would they buy this thing or not?" because they are like, "buy this, because they look tired and crazy." But I think...I understand (can't hear) but in my opinion, they are using this thing when they go outside, and not in the house or...24 hours every day.

Maiko: You mean wearing a baby using sling?

H: Yeah yeah. So I think it's useful for us.

Maiko: Pain-killer is useful?

H: Ah-huh, yeah, but they like...talking about that as a bad thing for mom.

Maiko: So are you saying the product itself is good but the way advertised that was not smart?

H: Yeah.

J: For me, I wouldn't be offended. As a mother, I understand what they say about pain-killer. But I can see why other people would be offended. Because it's not fun. Like the words they used...like, wearing your baby is..supp...

Maiko: Supposedly.

J: Yeah, supposedly. But it's not "supposedly." It is...a fact.

OC: Yeah, I agree. It creates a stronger bonding.

Maiko: Ok.

J: And you know, moms put up with the pain. Yes. But they do that... "hey, it makes me an official mom." Yeah, I can see why other people are offended. But like me, it's about, as I said...being offended by a particular advertisement is personal...I wouldn't care about it. But someone...

H: Don't moms think about another people, like...other things?

I: As a mom, when you have a child, you have so much to worry about. About your child, and then your body. You're going to have probably depression. Your boobs are going to be shit, your vagina is not going to look not like it was before, and stitches. And doing birth...four, five or six people saw what you like there in a movie, and you are going to pee, you are going to shit there, why do I care moms...if I look tired or if I carry my kid on my belly, on my back, on my my feet...why?

OC: Omg I can't believe she said all that, but it's true – it may be a small thing to care about. You've done so much more than that.

People laugh

Maiko: I'm going to now show all the social media backlash from people who were upset. And they used social media to respond to the ad because they were mad. So the first thing is a combination of this angry mom responding on Twitter. And that caused all the firestorm of criticisms on Twitter. So they all used the same hashtag...do you know what a hashtag is? So they all used a #MotrinMoms and responded to the ad. I'm going to show you 40 secs of it.

Play the Twitter video

Maiko: Ok, so the next one is... so if you can keep your comments in your head and tell me later. So the next one is another video response.

Play the outrageous mom video

Maiko: Next is another video. This is the last video so after that, you can spread out and sit wherever you want.

Play the culture jamming video

OC: People laugh at the line "It's for my husband."

Maiko: Well it was culture jamming video in response to the original ad. So this is a blog post and some sample comments. If you can scan.

Pass the handouts

Maiko: This one is Facebook page. There were two Facebook groups that were opposed to the ad and Motrin. One was "Boycott Motrin." The other was "Babywearing isn't painful. Boycott Motrin for saying it is." The first one is no longer there, but the second one is still there, so this is a copy of the Facebook page.

Hand out the hardcopy

Maiko: Did you all have a chance to look over?

J: Is this Face...

OC: She probably got confused because the page had a lot of irrelevant stuff, which has a point.

Maiko: Yeah this is Facebook. So should Johnson & Johnson have responded to the feedback it received, and if so, what should it have said? If not, why did they not need to respond? Should they have responded to all these social media backlash at all?

I: Why? You can use social media to say whatever you want. You don't have to expect an answer. So my answer is no.

Maiko: Interesting.

I: I can... People can learn the Bible; people can burn the Bible. Why should people respond? It's freedom of speech.

OC: Wow, again, I can't believe she said that. She's got such a free will.

K: If they want them to buy their products, then they probably want to respond and try to keep the people. Because presumably, they were hoping those baby-wearing moms were going to buy their products. So, if they want them to buy their products, then they would have to apologize, because I think that most moms who wear their babies take being a mom very seriously, and so they are going to be more easily offended about someone telling them that they do that to look cool when in fact, they are doing that for because they believe that's the best thing for their kids.

Maiko: Right.

J: In my opinion, I think an ad is strategy. You know, if I wear in the company, I would think the ad would change the mind of people in the market. If not, then put up with the ad and (can't hear).

Maiko: And if it fails like in this case...

J: If it fails, then the solution would be... I don't think any apology would change any people in this world. So, I'll pull out the ad and take some time till these moms, you know... to wonder around...

OC: So apology isn't the best strategy it seems like.

Maiko: to kind of calm down?

J: yeah. And then do and make a choice depends on...

I: And they also had a free advertisement. This kind of reaction is probably what they wanted. They had a free advertisement. All these outrageous moms... if you apologize, they are going to be outraged. They are going to stay that way. But they had a free advertisement. People talked about it.

Maiko: Oh I see! When you say free, you mean word-of-mouth, buzz.

I: It became huge. I'd never head about this kind of pain-killer, but now I know because so many people talked about it. It's basically free advertisement. Social media...people are talking about this topic...

Maiko: Even though that's negative?

I: Why should you have to talk about positive thing? We all talk about negative things too.

Maiko: Yeah.

J: It's advertisement.

I: And people talk.

Maiko: Talk more about negative things.

J: I mean, I mean, for me, it's not maybe if you on that product, it is maybe if it's on that advertisement. So if it's on that advertisement, then it's a time you will remember from all other pain medicines. (can't hear). That's what advertisements are. It is the name...it will be in the mind of people.

Maiko: Sure.

G: (can't hear) If it's a bad ad, then at a store, I will look for this product.

OC: It's a valid comment and I think there's some truth to that. Like Diet Dr.Pepper's "Just For Men" soda. I bet some women who saw the commercial got the soda to show women can drink it too.

G: It's actually nothing (can't hear)

Maiko: Ok, so the next question would be...should they have responded by posting tweets to the #MotrinMoms? I guess you just all said, except K, that they didn't really have to respond to that. H? Would you agree they didn't have to respond?

H: I think...as a company, maybe they should do something. Maybe what was the main idea of this commercial? What they mean?

Maiko: Where would you do that?

H: Why they said that?

Maiko: Ok, so explain why they did this advertisement. And would you do that on company website? Or Facebook? Twitter? Or would you make a video on YouTube? How should they do that?

H: I think they have to think what is more like...so that people can see about the...

Maiko: Ok, more visible...

H: Yeah.

I: If you are really bothered, maybe the...company website because probably you are going to look for people who are responsible for, so you are going to go to the website, media relations person who's responsible or who's in charge and you are going to see that if you are really bothered.

Maiko: Ok.

J: And if you want to do it, then maybe sites that moms are reading. If they do apology, then the audience would be these moms, right? So maybe their Facebook because they are using Facebook...and their own social media...they can do apology if they want to do that.

H: Maybe they can do party or TV show and they can do better than the advertisement.

Maiko: I see. Ok, is there one or more social media channels that the company could use that would be especially good for demonstrating that it is being honest and genuine with its response? In other words, to show you're honest and genuine, which social media should the company use?

I: church.

OC: People laugh

I: Even if they're apologizing, they are not being honest. So why would they fake? Why be...you know?

Maiko: Why would you say they are not being honest?

I: If you want to be honest and genuine, go to church.

Maiko: Haha. K?

K: I don't know if they have to apologize on all the social media. I think it would be good for them to acknowledge bad (can't hear) they created. I mean, I would be offended by something like this, but I would probably just roll my eyes, and (can't hear) every time the ad is shown, because that's what I do at those stupid commercials.

OC: “acknowledgement” seems to be important based also on what I heard in the last group too.

I: How much time do you really invest in writing? I have other stuff to do. I want to do other stuff. It’s not like a woman who’s being offended personally like, we don’t have freedom, we are beaten every day, or you don’t have rights and can’t vote – It’s not like that!

K: I would probably put that on my Facebook page and make fun of it. But I think that they would have to just respond...so you know, hashtag would be a good way to respond. If they have Facebook page, like, “responding to this backlash...” There’s something similar I read about a few months ago...maybe Target. Something about breast feeding (can’t hear)...and there was a pretty significant uprising against them and if they don’t issue an apology, then again you’re losing customers. Customer service...from business standpoint, you have to respond somehow to the public when they make a mistake and recognize they made a mistake. I don’t know. This was just a mistake from a business point.

J: The thing is that when you...every company who advertise...have an ad, of course you are going to offend somebody. Of course you are going to offend somebody. And have to apologize in some way...

I: But you have colored people, you have people with long hair, people with short hair, people with curly hair. Italian. I mean...people make fun of us every day. Pizza Hut. That’s what people do. Why should I be offended?

J: I mean, the thing is, they made this ad. They always make choice to attract, I mean...people...like (can’t hear). I see that...a...(can’t hear) what it is...a drink? But the thing was...it’s not for women...

Maiko: Yeah I know what you’re talking about...Dr. Pepper!

J: Yeah, Dr. Pepper. It’s not for women. This is men’s choice. See? It’s offensive. They made a choice to offend someone. But it was advertisement at the same time. I was eager to drink it. It’s business.

OC: People laugh

J: So whatever you do, it’s about how you strategize to offend somebody. But offending somebody at the same time includes the marketing.

OC: That’s an interesting point.

I: Yeah, people talk.

J: So it's a business choice. But sometime there're some cases everyone agrees it's so offensive. And you should not be allowed to I mean, continue. If you do an ad and offend, you do another one. So you don't have to ask apology if you make a business mistake.

I: If I have fake boobs, I would be offended by the moms' advertisement, come on!

OC: People laugh, but that's true.

J: It's a personal choice.

Maiko: If Johnson & Johnson responds to some people's comments on a blog, would it then be unfair to people who they don't respond to? Is it better to respond to some or none at all?

I: None at all.

Maiko: None at all? What about other people? Would you agree?

G: None at all.

J: Like some important stuff...some will speak up and some won't.

Maiko: So are you saying...

J: Because mothers choose to be interactive. Some are on Facebook.

Maiko: But then on a blog, should they respond to some moms or none at all?

J: Do some kind of...is...personal, like only personal. Like...what I mean is like...some make videos, right? And some moms interact on Facebook. So if you Johnson & Johnson...(can't hear) parties between the two...who responded...on that advertisement...but if you mean by general apology or by, I mean ask for apology, so it depends...I mean women are kind of different, so which do you mean...

OC: That's a good point – audience for each social media channel differ in some ways so apology or message needs to be more likely tailored.

Maiko: Some bloggers...Like for example, one of the examples that I gave you...

J: Ok, more general statement then...

Maiko: Or those bloggers who wrote about how offensive that was...Should Johnson & Johnson comment on each blog?

J: Oh.

I: No, you have my one comment at the end.

Maiko: Would you feel unfair if they responded if they responded to some bloggers?

H: Yes.

I: Yes.

G: Yes. You might seem ignorant.

J: Yes.

Maiko: So it's better not to do at all? Would you agree, K?

K: Yeah. I mean, it's a bad choice to ignore everything. It's a good choice to respond, but you have to be responding to everybody. I mean, it's usually cheap...it's usually more expensive to...(can't hear) do something like this, (can't hear).

Maiko: Ok, good. Thank you. What about...how can the company demonstrate a commitment to having a good conversation with moms?

I: They already do, all the baby products.

OC: Wow, I didn't expect that answer!

Maiko: So by providing good products.

I: I mean I was a-three year-old when I first acknowledged two nine south (?) and I remember Johnson & Johnson in a small country in Switzerland, in Italy. So they already do. They always have.

K: I actually have wondered about the advertisements lately because they have this natural product then they have this old product in the same magazines...They have two ads for new stuff and two ads for the old stuff. I mean how can they advertise both of these products at the same time and imply one is better than the other? Do they think moms are stupid, or do they think moms who are reading this (can't hear)?

Maiko: I think it's like old and New Coke.

I: But you buy a brand. You basically buy Johnson & Johnson. It's been reliable for ages. So you can buy either natural one if you are into organic stuff or whatever or just original line, which has been in a market forever.

K: But they are almost saying the old stuff is pretty much bad.

I: I haven't seen the ads though.

J: I don't think it's about being mad but about being different product. If you like organic stuff, we have this product. But if you are not, we also have this product. I think it's about difference.

Maiko: Alright. So, throughout the crisis like this, if company provides good products, then would you consider the company is demonstrating a commitment to having a good conversation with moms?

G: Yeah.

H: Yeah.

I: What kind of conversation?

Maiko: By actions or that sort of thing perhaps.

I: Yeah.

J: I mean, like, it's all about personality. The thing is, like I said earlier, with the drink, I think the company did advertisement – this is for men, this is for women...I think it was successful. And if they made me do that. If I like the product, I will go drink it. So even people are opposed to this advertisement, maybe they will keep buying the product.

Maiko: Because now the product got attention.

J: Yeah.

Maiko: How could Johnson & Johnson have involved moms in the creation of the ad before launching the ad as a major campaign on billboards, in magazines, and online? How could they have involved moms in the creation of the ad before putting out there?

I: Do we know if they did? We don't know who else was behind the ad. Maybe there were moms.

Maiko: Oh I see.

I: They are moms. Career moms.

OC: I don't know what she means now I hear...

G: Actually, woman was the one who was talking, wasn't it? Because it was a woman talking the ad, right?

J: Yeah...but I think when you bring an advertisement, there was a group of women who were responsible for all this. You know, as a productive work (?)...I mean, there are, there would be different advertisement then...important persons who decide would decide this advertisement would be effective or not.

Maiko: So those people were at the company...

OC: I don't know what I was going to say.

J: Yes. The thing is it's sort about important women. I don't think there are moms, women of course. But women would catch. If there was one or two women, they would know this advertisement might, you know, offend some...

OC: Ok, that I get it what she meant. She doesn't think there were any women involved in the creation of this ad, even at the company because if there was, this ad wouldn't have been created.

Maiko: How could they have done that? How could they have involved moms? Should they have tweeted? Focus groups? Or just talk in person?

I: Focus group.

H: Focus group.

G: Focus group is fine. But I don't think they need that to come up with ad. Coming up with an ad, you have rules and principles, and...things they have to follow...people who are advertising. So I actually know what they are doing. They should show...

I: Yeah, they should show before putting it out there.

G: So you know, they don't know what they are doing; they know what they are doing. And probably we cannot tell they had a focus group or not.

OC: That's true that we can't know. But I would hope if they indeed had one, then someone would have told them this wasn't smart and they would've made a different choice.

G: But I believe that there were principles and things to follow as a company to come up with advertisement, so by then, who knows, there were women, or they weren't. But I think they don't really need women to come up with this because they really do know what they are doing.

OC: I'm not sure if they knew what they were doing. So I'm getting confused if they are offended or not. They seemed like they weren't in the beginning but...

J: But I think it was a mistake at most. They don't understand their parties, like... Johnson & Johnson has been producing these products for ages, right? And men... are mostly have not... (can't hear) they didn't include women. If not now, they most likely didn't include women... to show this ad before putting the ad. So like this kind of product, which only women would be using. Most likely the one who chooses this product is woman. The one knows anything would be women. But I think... they most likely failed to include women in their advertisement.

Maiko: Ok, lastly, I think is time is almost up, so real quick, this is the actual response they did. So they didn't respond to any social media. But they did respond to a few emails, so this was one. Also, they put an apology letter on their website.

I: She's the mom!

OC: She's referring to the VP of Marketing who supposedly wrote it (or sign it).

Maiko: I just want to hear what you think about their response. Apology.

Hand out the apology letter and email response.

I: Did moms stop reacting after the apology? Or did it go on?

Maiko: No. It went on. So what do you think? Words they used? Attitude? Or...

I: They did exactly what I've been telling. Those people knew exactly what they were doing.

OC: At this point, I think by "knew exactly what they were doing," I and J at least mean that Johnson & Johnson knew it might offend some people but it did anyway to get people's attention to make them still buy the product.

I: Those were parents, moms or even Vice President. I worked for a huge business, insurance company. I know exactly how they did their advertisement. Before you show it to the general public, you show it to a focus group, to people. How do they react? People talk. It's going to work because people are going to talk about it.

OC: Does she really think Johnson & Johnson showed it to a focus group?

Maiko: But do you think Johnson & Johnson did a good job responding? The words they chose or the way they said that or...

I: Yeah, yeah.

Maiko: Does it sound genuine and honest?

I: Yeah, yeah. Very sympathetic.

OC: Finally got some answers for my question...

Maiko: Ok.

G: Person who wrote this...that is a mom.

Patrizia: Yeah, Vice President.

J: By the way, it might be a strategy. For me, like if I were a manager of the company, I would definitely make...I mean...why the Vice President? She is...the Vice President of Marketing. I think the strategy. Why not President of the Marketing?

OC: Good, that's a valuable comment.

I: Maybe she was in charge of responding.

J: No, no. Because there's no such thing as honest in business. Maybe the president is a man who has Motrin. But the choice of her being the respondent is marketing. I mean she has three children.

OC: Ok, so by choosing a woman with kids is a strategy in her opinion.

J: You know, if I saw a man's name, I would be like, "of course."

I: Even it's a strategy, look at the words they used.

J: Of course the words...

I: Sincere apology.

OC: I personally disagree.

I: "It's very important to us," "We have heard you," "We believe deeply that moms..."

OC: You can always say that and not actually think that. Words are cheap.

Maiko: Would you believe that?

I: No, I don't believe that, but it sounds really good.

OC: lol

G: Really good.

I: So if they want to do that, they did a good job.

J: They did an amazing job even with the selection of writing.

G: Who should write.

Maiko: What about you, K? What do you think? You were kind of laughing when you were reading that.

K: Genuince could be an effective appreciation of using such a mocking tone. (?)

Maiko: What tone did you say?

K: A mocking tone.

Maiko: Mocking tone?

K: They are making fun of you. And my guess would be if she's the VP of Marketing for a huge company, she probably wasn't (can't hear) her babies.

Maiko: Because she's got money or...

K: Because someone else might be taking care of her babies.

Maiko: Ok.

I: But this is exactly offending working moms. You know what I mean? If we talk about someone with money, she is not going to wear her child because she has the career. I had a career too. But you're going to offend moms who have careers and who want to have babies. This is exactly what they do, so whatever we talk about you are going to offend someone.

K: Well, I guess my thought is she could have thrown in her personal experience. Like, you know, she could have said "I very much enjoy wearing my babies." But just saying she's the mom...And these moms are saying "We have a specific reason why we are offended by you."

OC: That's an interesting point.

J: I think she could've done that. But this is an apology on behalf of the company, it's not about her.

I: It's going to be too personal.

OC: Ok, that's a great discussion of how personal an apology letter should be.

J: Like inserting her in this position is wise. I mean, in the company, representing the company. she's the mom. You would kind of incline to take her word. But saying "I also use this, It's painful" then it would be too personal. So I think the response by her kind of make a good (can't hear) purpose but at the same time (can't hear)

Maiko: What do you think, H? What do you think about the letter?

H: It's ok. I don't care, haha. I don't know why people are mad because of commercial. I don't care...if they write, then I will read and ok. I think that somebody starts this comment and others follow them and that's a problem. I think our (can't hear) main problem is you should think and not about this. If they don't want to accept that, then they don't. If they do they do. I don't care.

G: In addition, I think also it's smart to only respond to ones who write directly to them and not...you know, social media. And also traditionally, upper (can't hear) apology and (can't hear).

Maiko: Why would you think that?

G: Because at the same time, when people hear about this, they will go website.

Maiko: Oh, I see I see.

G: Rather than Facebook. So it's one way of advertisement.

Maiko: Direct the traffic.

G: Yeah.

I: And it's also because so many comments on Facebook and Twitter...they just don't make sense. So if you answer to one, you have to answer to all of them.

J: So it is kind of recognizing their website more. And definitely make...on the face, this would not be there, they will be.

H: So it's better...it's ok to respond because (can't hear) like that, because it's just comments on Facebook and on the Internet. And they just advertise this because the problem is small for them. But if they call and do something...low problem, maybe they should answer to another. But now it seems difficult.

Maiko: So put it on the website so everyone can see?

H: Yeah.

I: I also wonder if they had more clicks after this kind of...

H: Of course they would have.

J: Definitely! I mean it's advertisement, right? When they do this, they would know like...I mean next to this paper, there are different product, like flashing.

G: I mean Johnson (can't hear).

Maiko: Ok. Anything to add before we end?

J: I think like even this advertisement worked.

OC: People laugh

I: I would, if this woman put the same effort helping children...

Maiko: Are you going to Safeway now and buy their product?

J: It will become familiar to me. That's the whole thing about advertisement. I didn't know they have pain-killer.

I: Me either. Now I know.

Maiko: And K?

K: I'm not going to take it because it's not safe for pregnancy, and I know that. But it doesn't sway me one way or the other because I rarely buy these kind of pain-killers because you pay a lot for the brand name. So if I see it and offended then I'll most likely make fun of it and see if I can get other people to make fun of it.

Maiko: Great. Thank you so much for your participation.

Group 3

Maiko: Well, thank you so much for being here, and I'm sorry again about the location change. Thank you for being flexible. And if you can please introduce yourself briefly, maybe your name, your kids –how many, boy or girl, their age -, what kind of social media you use and how often.

L: My name is L. And I have a two-month-old, baby girl. Her name is M. And I use Facebook.

Maiko: How often?

L: Every day.

N: I'm N. I have a three-year-old daughter. I use Facebook, every day.

Maiko: Great.

O: Hi, I'm O. I have a five-year-old daughter, P. And I use Facebook, every day, like everyone else does. And I also use LinkedIn. That's probably every few days.

Maiko: Good.

Q: Q. I have a three and a half-year-old son, and I have another baby on the way this summer. Oh social media... I use Facebook. I check it almost every day. I only post once or twice a week. And I do do some message boards and chat groups and kind of fan sites and that kind of things...some of the books and stuff that I like. (can't hear).

Maiko: Ok. Does anyone do blogs or read blogs? Mom blogs?

Q: I read blogs.

L: Oh, I actually read babycenter.com. When I was pregnant, I was using that every day and chat with moms and...

O: I read blogs but mostly political blogs, like Unicorn Bungie (?) or Human Rights blogs or...usually on Facebook though because I'm friends with them so their status also come through news feed.

Maiko: What about YouTube?

O: Yeah.

Q: Yeah.

L: Sometime.

N: Yeah.

Q: I YouTube with my son. (can't hear) all the album he (can't hear).

O: I use Skype too. Does that count?

Maiko: Skype...usually not. But Google+, Twitter...does anyone tweet?

Q: No, I don't.

O: No.

L: I do use YouTube a lot.

Q: I am on Google+ but none of my friends are, so there aren't anything to see, so I don't do anything to do with it.

O: I keep getting the invites. (can't hear)

Maiko: Great. So, generally speaking, when a company puts out an ad that offends its customers, how should it respond?

Q: Generally speaking? I don't know... They always apologize. I personally when they explain a little bit about this is what we meant or this was or this here was our mistake... so it wasn't like "wups sorry." "We really meant this way." So, sorry that people got it in a wrong way.

Maiko: Where should they do that?

Q: Where? God, I really don't follow any companies on Facebook, so I know they have a Facebook but I personally wouldn't see it. But I do a lot of the new sites, like Huffington Post on my phone, multiple times a day, so when they do something big, put it on there and respond that way, so that kind of media, I would...(can't hear) I guess.

Maiko: Do you think you would go to TV and try to see the news? When something big happens, like crises, where would you go to get more information?

L: I would probably google it.

Maiko: Google, yeah.

Q: Yeah.

N: Yeah.

Q: If there're thousand recalls or something big, yeah.

Maiko: Do you think they should use social media?

O: To other crises?

Maiko: To respond to offended moms or customers.

L: Yes.

Q: Yeah, because a lot of people are going to follow that than something else. More and more do.

O: I think that if they are corporate socially responsible, they would do that, especially if it was offending lots of customers, you would hope that they would publishing a

statement that could be on the social media, it could be on their website, it could be public. Especially if it's a public company, I feel like they kind of have a duty if they are offensive, tell the public, "Look, we didn't mean this way." And if they did mean that way, say, "I'm sorry."

Maiko: Ok. What about you, N? Do you have anything to add?

N: No, I agree with them. I think they should...you know, you can put it on Facebook...but like apology on Facebook...you would never know, so you could put it on local news or public news or...

Maiko: Ok. Now I'm going to show you the advertisement that Johnson & Johnson put out a few years ago. This offended some moms. It created huge social media backlash. So if you can all watch this and tell me what you think...

O: When did this come out? Can you tell us?

Maiko: 2008.

O: Oh.

Maiko: Can you all see?

Play the ad.

Maiko: So what do you think?

O: That offends me more as a woman than as a mom.

OC: Interesting!

Q: Yeah, I was going to say.

O: Women are crazy, emotional, so now we have a way to justify it.

OC: People laugh

Q: Well and talking about wearing your baby as a fad. Humans have been wearing baby since humans were humans. So how babies going to go around before strollers and wheels were invented, you know?

O: Long before we were civilized in the U.S., right? Our country is pretty young but cultures in another places...they were carrying babies in wraps.

Maiko: Did you all wear your babies? Or I mean...

L: No, I haven't, but I'm going to start because it's just a lot harder without a baby carrier.

Maiko: And why do you think you are going to use that?

L: Because I did not use it and it's been putting a lot of...it's been hard to get the baby out of car seat, and put on a stroller, I would like to...just put in my sling and go to a store instead of doing over and over.

Maiko: Sure. Any other reason why you would want to use it?

Q: R loved it. I could wear it in our house. He was very clingy. Some kids are little harder and some kinds are not. He always wanted to be held. So it was either carry him and he's right next to me, or my hands are never ever be free for eating or anything. So and he really liked it. He loved being wrapped around like that. When he sleeps at night, put him in the sling and...

Maiko: So not for fashion, not for...

Q: Well, I did that...I picked one looked better than my first one that I had. (can't hear) year and a half. But it was totally secondary. It was more like how am I going to get through this day, and it is...it is...I mean they talked about, "supposedly." But having a baby on you is bonding. They want that attention and attachment.

O: Yeah.

N: I never used one, because mine was opposite of yours. She hated being strained.

Q: She wanted to do her own things.

N: I could never wrap her, I could never teach (can't hear) swallowing (can't hear). She hated it.

Q: Some kids do. At my baby group, he...independent from day 1. But he still wants to be held so.

N: I wish I could have one. Walk around and...even I tried to backpack once. Frisbee golfing...

O: That's the only one I haven't used. I've been using a sling but I actually, didn't need one especially because when she was young, I moved back to Southern Oregon so I wasn't really traveling a lot, so I didn't really have the need, I felt, whereas before I was moving a lot, living in Seattle, so. I pretty much stayed with her at home for the first six months. Also, she was pretty sick so that was the only reason why I wanted to keep her inside. Also, the only time I did use it was when I would go out and go hiking and I was

using backpack. That was the only way I could still hike with her being so young. I guess you can carry her, but that just...

Maiko: Yeah. So if you are offended or annoyed at least, what would it take for you to forgive them? Or could you forgive them?

OC: People laugh

L: I think something like that, it's kind of, I wouldn't...no matter...it's always going to be the view of them no matter what they say at one point.

OC: So the previous good reputation might not help the company once it offends its customers based on her comment.

O: Right?

L: It's never going to be out my head no matter what the company says I think.

Maiko: Would you still buy the product if you carry the baby and you are in pain?

L: I probably still buy if it hurts. I don't know.

O: I don't know. I feel like maybe, the company should do more than what she asks. So, this would upset me, so I would hope that they would respond and not make an ad that's so gender-biased. It's not like moms are the only ones that would ever carry their babies either.

N: Yeah, and it's not like...moms get backache only from carrying a baby?

OC: People laugh

O: But I'm the person who would always remember that. Eventually, if I saw another ad like that I would think about seeing this ad.

Q: If I'd never bought the Motrin product, then I wouldn't. If I was already buying, then it would color my image of them, but I would probably keep buying them. But if having not used that product regularly, it probably would color the company's image more, so I would be more likely to stop using the product.

Maiko: I see.

O: So higher switching cost for you, right?

Q: Yeah.

O: Because you don't really need it anyway.

Q: Why would I go to that company rather than sticking with what I had or I don't have that (can't hear) product.

Maiko: Ok, great. Now I'm going to show you all the social media backlash. If you can remember your comments, that'll be great. First one is a YouTube video of tweets. This one angry mom tweeted using a hashtag #MotrinMoms. And all the other angry moms used the same hashtag to go against the company.

Play the video

Maiko: Next one is a self video response on YouTube by this mom.

Play the outrageous mom video

OC: People laugh at her

Maiko: Next, is a video that moms created but it's a culture jamming video.

Play the boob video

OC: People laugh at lines like "It's a liberating experience" and "It's for my husband"

Q: Wow.

N: Haha.

Maiko: Next one is an example of a blog post that a mom wrote and some sample comments posted to the post. If you can scan...

Pass out the handout

Maiko: Did you all get the idea of what people said?

People say yes

Maiko: And this is a Facebook group and I copied and pasted the Wall. There were two Facebook groups that were created to go against the Motrin. One was called "Boycott Motrin," which is no longer available online, but the other one is this.

Hand out the Facebook group print-out

Maiko: Ok, so for all these social media backlash, should Johnson & Johnson have responded to any of these?

O: Yes. Not directly, but they should've responded to the outcry overall. (can't hear) individual single (can't hear) and said "We are sorry to you."

Q: Yeah.

O: Another thing is...Johnson & Johnson owns it, right?

Maiko: Yeah.

O: So that was a good point. So even though boycott Motrin wasn't a (can't hear) choice...

Q: How many Johnson & Johnson products do you think that people buy?

N: Yeah, like powder, oil...

L: Everything.

Q: Tylenol...

Maiko: So not every single comment, but maybe company website?

L: Yeah.

O: Yeah.

Q: Yeah.

Maiko: What about blog posts or Facebook comments?

Q: Well, Johnson & Johnson is perfectly capable of doing that...putting out a post and say who they are and sending out the links to the site.

L: I think if they went and did something that, they should try to do that to every blog post, even though it takes time. That shows their effort and how sorry they are.

Maiko: So, every blog?

L: Yeah.

O: I'm sure they appreciate that, but if they do go that far, I think that they will get the backlash from the other side for catering these crazy moms who are really upset...I mean, not that I think that but I can see...

Q: Some of them are over the top.

O: Yeah.

Q: Like this one, “the one man.”

L: Yeah.

N: Yeah.

OC: People laugh

Q: Or that tampon comment...if you get to the trolls...I think it depends...I mean, in this case, this was a stupid commercial. I wouldn't expect them to go to every single...like, place. I would expect them to do something more general thing. And acknowledge...like acknowledge that there was outcry. If it's more of a danger thing like recall that can potentially harm...like a...when you hear about the...

Maiko: Like toys...?

Q: No, like formula in China. If that happened in our country, where people are actually in danger, then I would definitely expect them to go individual thing...this Facebook, and that Facebook and make as many thousands of postings as necessary. But this was harmless, just bone-headed? So more of a general thing...for me wouldn't be a surprise.

Maiko: Yeah. Do you all agree?

N: I think they should post on their website. You know, when you first go on big “sorry” thing or kind of thing. I think it's impossible to go onto every single thing of person that didn't like it. How are they going to find all those people?

Maiko: So if they are going to do that apology post on their website, what would you expect to see besides “sorry”?

O: I think they need more than that if they want to be effective.

Maiko: Ok, what else?

O: If I were working there, yeah, you should definitely have something on the website, apologizing not just to baby-wearing moms but just to, just to everyone. I wouldn't limit the apology to moms because that can leave out the rest of people who don't fall into the traditional roles that we see parents.

OC: That's interesting point about apologizing not just angry moms or baby-wearing moms but everyone. She sounds very gender-issue aware.

N: Well, we have dog-carrying moms too, right?

O: But I think that it's smart for them to have an article in a big newspaper because I think that they should start buzz outside the Internet and eventually it'll end up on the Internet and it'll end up on its blog. But I think they should run an ad or run an article on Huffington Post or in New York Times...that's another way to come from (can't hear) and that will be talked about on the web, and also have a direct apology.

OC: Traditional media should address the issue too.

Q: I've seen...I've seen a blog that talks about (can't hear) apology (can't hear) they are saying. Not about this particular thing but about other things.

Maiko: So to show that they've heard people and would you explain your intention? Should the company explain its intention for creating the ad?

N: Yeah.

Maiko: What other components does it have in their apology?

Q: It's...like I said, in this case no one was injured. So "We're sorry, we meant to be humorous. We see moms all the times. There're moms in our office who wear babies. So we meant to be humorous. We are so sorry that we came off in a negative way." You know.

OC: Great, actual words.

O: See, I think...I think my mind is little skewed in opinion because of...doctoring myself in laws. So I would not be as detailed in that. I wouldn't let them explain their motive because I think that that would also make people mad. So if you do an apology, sometimes when you justify the way you did it, it's not like...you're like, "I'm sorry, but I was really saying this"...in a way it kind of makes people feel like you didn't take it seriously, so I think sometime you should just say, "Look, we realize there are lots of people hurt. We're sincerely sorry for this." But do not explain any more that they're validating once again.

OC: Wow that's interesting point about double-validation!

Q: See, I want them to acknowledge specifics. Plus (can't hear) very general apology, I'd go "really? What part are you apologizing for? Are you apologizing for type of face? Are you apologizing for this part of it or that part of it?" Yeah.

Maiko: Interesting.

Q: And I would work with parents...I work with kids too, but when I talk to parents, I find it, I personally find it helpful to say, "Sorry about the miscommunication about THIS SPECIFIC THING."

OC: People laugh

Q: Yeah. You know, and then everything else gets bundled into it if the parents are having a bad day. So I guess my take on where it comes from is different or...what I have to do as a job.

OC: Q is a middle school teacher.

Maiko: I see. What about the culture jamming video?

Q: Hillarious.

Maiko: Haha, should they have responded to that?

O: No need.

N: No.

L: No.

Q: Haha, unless they want to acknowledge it's funny.

OC: lol

Maiko: It was funny though, right?

Q: It was funny. I liked it.

Maiko: So, next question is: Is there one or more social media channels that the company could use that would be especially good for demonstrating that it is being honest and genuine with its response?

Q: I don't follow Twitter but Twitter is so popular. I read articles about this and that company tweetering such thing. So...

Maiko: That shows honesty and being genuine?

Q: I think it's a good way to reach a ton of people.

Maiko: Right.

Q: If you're asking which social media channels make it sound more honest and genuine, dear load, haha.

O: Haha. They're awful at this, right?

OC: People laugh

Q: Maybe, maybe like blogs or like parenting.com that kind of thing? So that's not...it does aim the parents and that parents respect and go to when they're looking for "why does my child 3-month old and (can't hear)" thing?...I wouldn't go to Facebook to look for an apology.

O: Yeah. I think that for me, it's not so much the words and where it's put, but it it's sincere in a sense that "ok, they say that it's...but are they actually changing their business practices?" So if I get an apology, that might not be enough for me. So I would...why can't they...so some...why can't they donate hundred thousand dollars to some...

Q: Charity that gives slings to moms.

O: Yeah, something that is action that can support those words.

OC: Actions speak louder than words.

O: Because I feel like just the words alone are not enough.

Maiko: Yeah, sure. How about...like you just mentioned blogs or company website, Facebook...if you see their apology on those sites, would you consider that the company being accessible during crises?

O: Yes.

L: Yes.

Q: Yeah, it's a response that they saw something happening.

O: But it would only be a...because I would want to hear the comments they are taking besides sure, this wouldn't happen...Motrin executives and Johnson & Johnson executives are getting questioned and so...I would be interested to hear what they are saying and what's reported on Facebook.

Maiko: Ok. What about...how can the company use social media to show that it has made a substantive effort to understand what moms think?...I guess you mentioned by actions. Is there anything else?

OC: Silence

N: I think social media is hard because it's just a man or woman sitting typing up some words and you know...

Q: If there are a lot of like groups like especially on Facebook..cause groups or something like that. If we see them backing some of these things like...do you guys know “Birth and (can’t hear)?”...if they are seen sponsoring them, and you know,

O: “Healthy start for kids” and stuff like that.

Q: Yeah. “Birth and Free (can’t hear)” and very few of these...I have on mine...but if they were seen backing some of them either finding actually or resources or you know, promoting this or that, that kind of thing. It doesn’t necessarily have to be monetary relationship though for these companies, it might be the easiest. But there’re also...like...there’re also lots of PR campaigns like we have volunteers coming and opening our library for students every day, all year, for free, because we don’t have staff to support that anymore. So kids can come and not wait freezing outside in the morning...and that was a bank. And they didn’t...We thanked them but they didn’t get much public thing, but the company thought that was important to find places for all their employees. So I think that kind of thing...when they’re visible...you can find that kind of thing on the credit union website if you went there. So I think, I think that kind of thing, when they are supporting...this is moms so when they’re supporting mothers...this is 2008, so mothers affected by Katrina or there’re a lot of things they can support financially, volunteer-wise, just donating free promotional resources like you know, “we will pay for your advertising for this” or training for volunteers, you know? There’re lots of things they could do that’s visible through Facebook, through their website...

OC: That’s a new idea about backing up groups to show their apology.

O: And if they’re smart at PR, you don’t have to actually do the news media part, right? If you do those things, and other people would write about that. What interesting is that this company I (can’t hear) for in Portland, G-diapers, I didn’t use these diapers but I went to an entrepreneurship conference in Boston when I was undergrad, and I met its Founder and he makes bio(can’t hear) diapers with wife. And he has this law(can’t hear) business where it’s triple-bottom lines they count for people...so it’s not just money. And they have a day care center for their building just for the employees. To him, it shows his care...”we care about you” and not just you but what you bring to the table. So it costs a lot of money but if they decided to change corporate policy, they decided “hey, maybe we should offer our employees day care in building.” To me, I would be loyal...if you started changing things like that, you can keep me.

Maiko: I see, great. Ok...If Johnson & Johnson responds to some people’s comments on a blog, would it then be unfair to people who they don’t respond to?

Q: No.

Maiko: Is it better to respond to some or none at all?

Q: I think if they’re going to respond on visual blogs, they should pick ones that everyone are reading, because...

L: Just the top ones.

Q: Yeah, ones that get thousands of hits a day and not the ones that get five hits a month.

Maiko: And how can it show that it values each person's reaction regardless of what it is? Like when the company responds on comments, how can it show that it values each person's comment?

Q: I think they can't.

L: They can't. I feel like no matter what they do, no matter how they apologize, they did it. What's done is done. All they can do is just not do that again. And like she said, try to do make different. It's going to be in everyone's head for the rest of the life.

Q: Just nature of the Internet, people who look for things would be upset about some of these comments right here.

L: Yeah.

Q: They can't respond to each person because there're trolls out there, bud-heads out there. You know, so...maybe 50 years ago they can. Just nature of the Internet.

L: It's just impossible to please everybody.

O: Yeah.

N: Yeah.

O: That's why I feel like actions, whether or you decide to flash (can't hear) or do something, that is (can't hear). Also, I feel like not that you can buy people' love, but if you're looking at this business, you kind of talk about...person...well, it's a company...it speaks about money. So I feel like they actually prove to the public "hey look, we're putting our money and now we're going to use it for something good." I think that that does something even though that doesn't make everything right, but that shows that they gave up something. They gave up what matters to them, because you wonder when they publish an apology, whether they're just trying to...

Q: Yeah they just say it even though they mean nothing.

Maiko: How about: How can Johnson & Johnson's response sound spontaneous and not scripted?

Q: If they were cut at a press conference or something, they might sound spontaneous but I think that when they post...

N: It's going to be edited.

L: Yeah.

O: Yeah.

Q: Major company like...some of them might be unscripted but...

O: Lawyers are not going to let that do that.

Q: PR people might sound spontaneous but...I wouldn't expect that though.

Q: I would expect some are scripted. I would expect some professionals, intelligents,...

Maiko: What about social media responses?

Q: Same thing. They are written. They are totally written.

Maiko: Are they more casual?

Q: Not necessarily, they can be though.

Maiko: On Twitter and Facebook...

O: I think that they should be more casual but that's my view about...if you are business, you should sound professional, always.

OC: I'm not sure if I would agree with that, but it depends on what she means by professional.

Maiko: Interesting. How could Johnson & Johnson involved moms in the creation of the ad before deciding to launch as a major campaign on billboards, in magazines and online?

Q: Ask. Ask some moms who actually use slings?

N: Do focus groups.

L: Yeah.

N: Like show it to people and...just pick random moms and...

L: Use moms instead of Motrin brand or women in the office or whatever.

Q: Asking moms...having guys on the street asking moms, "Does this hurt your back?" or do a little research. They would probably (can't hear) because moms probably would say no.

O: I agree completely, but I think there's another issue to this, and it's that institutionalized...so like whoever is in power...the role that controls the corporations are held mostly by men. So I'm not going to be surprised if men made that.

OC: People laugh

L: I'm...pretty sure.

Q: Pretty sure.

O: And I feel that's a big problem because the reason why women are often (can't hear) is because we're underrepresented by the top executives and by the managers of these companies. So...

Q: People who made this in these positions had no idea. Mine as well make a commercial that's prostrate (?)

O: Right? We don't walk around and saying that we understand what it's like (can't hear) disfunction (can't hear), right?

OC: People laugh

O: But men do that!

Q: I was thinking when I was watching this too, "No women wrote this. No women who had a baby wrote this." (can't hear) this ad.

OC: People laugh

Maiko: Is there any words that were used...

Q: Like the young woman slang? Like, "righhht? Righhht?"

Maiko: Haha, that tone?

Q: It's like they are trying, trying to sound like a woman.

L: Haha.

O: Yeah.

Q: Doesn't that make sense?

N: (can't hear) team pregnancy or whatever...

Q: So it might be partially acting of a female voice or...but what was it...the script is here...

O: The last two lines were what really got me.

L: "If I look tired and crazy"...men always say that.

O: Before that, "it totally makes it look like an official mom." "So if I look tired and crazy, people would understand why." It's like...

Q: Yeah, and little phrases like "go hands free?" Have you ever head of moms saying "hands free?"

OC: People laugh

Q: I talk about "HAVING my hands free" or "use my hands," I'd never...I'd never talk about hands free. I might have (can't hear) mono hands (?)

O: The problem...I do have problem with that so that's why I carry my baby on my side like that. And I bet if I have used a sling or something else, I probably would have (can't hear)

Q: Ok, so what..."moms who carry their babies cry less than moms who don't? I sure do!" – I don't know women who speak like this. "These things put a ton of weight on your..." Yeah. And the line about...here it is, "the front baby carriers, the shwings, wrap, pouch?" They're talking about...

N: Kangaroos?

Q: "Shwings"- the only time I've heard of shwings is the old...

O: The wind (can't hear)

Q: Yeah! Shwiiiiing! No women wrote that. I'm sorry!

O: Why they...

Q: "Plus it TOTALLY makes me look like an official mom." I say "totally" but I don't say it like that.

O: I feel like...I have a five-year-old daughter so I've become more conscious about how she's responding to ads. And it's hard because oftentimes, she's like, "Oh, I can't do this because I'm a girl" or "I can't do this because it's a boy thing." So I'm studying the

sexuality in (can't hear) so it's becoming more fear to me. Stuff like this...we have this idea that well, women should be moms and this role, it's a normal role, so if you want to be, you should be. You have to be though an official mom and that use baby slings. So we're already...even though it doesn't piss off younger girls, in a way it's telling them that, "oh, that's the status quo. That's..."

Q: Mom wearing a baby...You know another commercial that pisses me off...really pisses me off...this commercial where mom and dad...dad and sons outside playing soccer or football or something, and he gets dirty, and mom and daughter inside, and they are happy because they can get all the stains off the boys' clothes. Why aren't they girls out in the yard playing? Boys are outside playing and girls are inside doing choirs. I was PISSED. When I first saw the commercial, R was a little baby and I was like I don't know if I ever have girls, but that thing take me off!

O: Right?

Q: I was talking to my friends and like, "Did you see that thing?" I mean, I talked to S about it, I...that was offensive! I didn't see anybody apologizing for that.

O: That's how all the things are.

L: Yeah, it's always women, how come it's never a man?

N: We have a few...I forget that...his name...the...powder...

O: Oh! That powder...(Can't hear)

Maiko: This is their actual apology they posted on their website, and also one email from an angry mom and the reply to that. If you can read and tell me what you like and dislike about it. This is the only things they did – they posted the apology letter on their website eventually and they replied to a few bloggers who emailed personally.

Hand out apology letter

Maiko: So they didn't respond to any of the social media. What do you think about their apology?

Q: I like this one better, the personal...email.

L: The email sounds more personal.

Q: Even though they are using some of the same words. They are using pretty much the same words there but it still feels a little more personal.

Maiko: Ok.

Q: And part of it is that...like the first part, “We are parents ourselves” sounds very very general but...”I...three children.”

Maiko: Do you believe that?

Q: Of course, because it’s a huge company – most of them are going to be parents at one point. Not that I believe it but still personal...you know, “I had a responsibility for this brand, I myself am a mom,” you know. “We had intended to...” ...”We take feedback seriously.” That sounds better because it’s more personal.

O: I do like the letter better. I read that one first.

Maiko: One from...

Q: Appendix H?

O: Marketing...

Steph: She’s saying Appendix A is better.

Maiko: Oh, A?

O: Yeah. A is better. H definitely sounds like there were some lawyers drafting this and looking it over.

Q: Yeah, I read this one first and I figured this was by PR or...

Maiko: What made you think lawyers wrote this?

O: What made me think? First because the way it’s structured...the sentences are short. For instance the sentence that starts, “With regards to the recent Motrin ad, we have heard you.” Legal writings, we are taught to be concise, to-the-point. And so...I wouldn’t write like that because I’m like flowery (?) writer...more creative, and I want to express myself in my sentences. But this is just...but I guess that’s the point of business writing.

Q: My first thought was PR people. But yeah.

OC: Interesting how Kala thought it was by lawyers and Q thought it was by PR ppl.

Maiko: It’s by VP of Marketing.

Q: But just because her name was on it, doesn’t mean she wrote it. I mean, she signed it.

Maiko: Right. Why did you think PR people wrote it?

Q: Because it's so general and so careful not to say anything new. Careful not to say anything that's offensive, not to say which part offended people...because what if they were really offended by this sentence part and not... so it seems extremely careful and bland...It seems like they're trying to apologize without actually saying "I'll be (can't hear) moms.

O: Yeah. I didn't like the part...

Q: And the last sentence about it'll take time to remove from magazine advertising, it sounds very granted (?) to me, like they're saying "please don't say anything in two days when you buy People magazine because we won't have time to get it out." Right? Whoever that was doing was like, "Ok, this is what's going to happen. These are where they are. We're going to take it down from the website, take it down from online"...So

Maiko: Any other reactions to this?

O: I don't...I appreciate the apology but the point of apology is that "we are moms ourselves and we take your feedback very seriously"...Once again, one of my issues is that they make it just mom issue, and it's not. And I feel like that's part of the problem. This is parenting issue, this is grandparents' issue. It's not just for moms. And so...

N: Yeah, I think it's pretty one-side. It just goes to moms.

L: It's one-sided because in their advertising, it was directed towards moms.

Q: And most of the feedback on the blog and stuff were mostly from moms and women. So I mean, I understand it's directed to moms because they were mostly...

Maiko: What do you think about the choice of the person who signed it?

O: I think that that was a strategic decision on their part. And I feel like CEO of Johnson & Johnson should also have said something, because for instance, when they do a financial report, the CEO has to sign and say "we are going to vouch (?) the record" right?

Q: Yeah.

O: So I think when they do a public apology, they should be putting their names down because why is this woman who's Vice President of Marketing doing it?

Q: She might have been directly involving the ad, but she isn't the one you think of being in charge of the company or brand.

L: We want to see the president and not the vice president.

O: Yeah.

N: It might have been because she's a woman too.

Q: Maybe she was the only woman (can't hear) the company. And I understand her department is directly related to what's going on. But I still assume the official public apology comes from the CEO of the company no matter who was...you know. When the chicken are killed for KFC...we expect the statement comes from the CEO and not the chicken slaughters.

OC: People laugh

O: The reason why they did this is try to distance themselves, so you know? This comes from consumer healthcare, so when we see the apology...I assume it's subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson?

Maiko: Yeah.

O: But it's not directly associated with Motrin, Tyrenol, or Johnson & Johnson.

Q: Yeah, they probably...Johnson & Johnson isn't in here.

OC: That's true. They didn't used "Johnson & Johnson" in the letter. That's pretty smart so that people won't associate this with them.

O: So if they used Johnson & Johnson, people would start putting together, "oh, they are the same company!" And I think that they are wanting to not do that. So they were thoughtful.

Maiko: Great, anything to add? Anything I didn't ask that you would like to express?

Q: I did think that some of the individual moms' posts and this letter here... I'm always surprised how mad people get. I understand that you could go, "wow" but...

L: Yeah, you don't have to be like...

O: Yeah, and how can you get mad like that and when states pass bills that are completely anti-women, nobody gets mad, in my opinion, and even vote for them?

Q: And they freak out about some stupid commercials. They are freaking out! "omg!" But if you have babies, you have something better you should be angry about. You really really do. There're lots of things out there...

O: Yeah, making about rights for little girls...

Q: Or going to Toy"R"Us and finding things that aren't pink.

OC: People laugh

O: Have you seen the commercial where this little girl goes to a store and says “Why’s everything pink or purple here?!”

OC: People keep commenting on about that.

Maiko: Well, thank you so much for your participation.

REFERENCES CITED

- Arpan, L. M., & Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. (2005). Stealing thunder: Analysis of the effects of proactive disclosure of crisis information. *Public Relations Review*, 31(3), 425–433. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2005.05.003
- Avery, E. (2010). Contextual and audience moderators of channel selection and message reception of public health information in routine and crisis situations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22(4), 378-403. doi: 10.1080/10627261003801396
- Bailey, M. T. (2011). *Power moms: The new rules for engaging mom influencers who drive brand choice*. Wyatt-MacKenzie.
- Barnett, J. M. (2002). *Focus groups tips for beginners: TCALL occasional research paper no. 1*. Retrieved from <http://www-tcall.tamu.edu/orp/orp1.htm>
- Bates, L., & Callison, C. (2008, August). *Effect of company affiliation on credibility in the blogosphere*. Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Conference, Chicago.
- Benoit, W. L. (1995). *Accounts, excuses, and apologies: A theory of image restoration*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Benoit, W. L. (1997). Image repair discourse and crisis communication. *Public Relations Review*, 23(2), 177-186.
- Benoit, W. L., & Drew, S. (1997). Appropriateness and effectiveness of image repair strategies. *Communication Reports*, 10(2), 153-163.
- Bortree, D. S., & Seltzer, T. (2009). Dialogic strategies and outcomes: An analysis of environmental advocacy groups' Facebook profiles. *Public Relations Review*, 35(3), 317-319. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.05.002
- Brenhouse, H. (2011, May 2). Man live-tweets U.S. raid on Osama bin Laden without knowing it. *TIME NewsFeed*. Retrieved from <http://newsfeed.time.com/http://newsfeed.time.com/2011/05/02/man-live-tweets-u-s-raid-on-osama-bin-laden-without-knowing-it/>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2010, February 10). 2009 H1N1 Flu (“Swine Flu”) and You. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/h1n1flu/qa.htm>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Choi, Y., & Lin, Y.-H. (2009). Consumer response to Mattel product recalls posted on online bulletin boards: Exploring two types of emotion. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 21(2), 198-207. doi: 10.1080/10627260802557506

- Coombs, W. T. (1999). *Ongoing crisis communication: Planning, managing, and responding*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coombs, W. T. (2002). Assessing online issue threats: Issue contagions and their effect on issue prioritization. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 2(4), 215-229. doi: 10.1002/pa.115
- Coombs, W. T. (2006). The protective powers of crisis response strategies: Managing reputational assets during a crisis. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 12(3/4), 241–260. doi: 10.1300/J057v12n03_13
- Coombs, W. T. (2007). Protecting organization reputations during a crisis: The development and application of situational crisis communication theory. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(3), 163-176. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550049
- Coombs, W. T. (2008). *Crisis communication and social media*. Retrieved from http://www.Instituteforpr.org/essential_knowledge/detail/crisis_communication_and_social_media/
- Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2001). An extended examination of the crisis situations: A fusion of the relational management and symbolic approaches. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 13(4), 321-340. doi:10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1304_03
- Coombs, W. T. & Holladay, S. J. (2002). Helping crisis managers protect reputational assets: Initial tests of the situational crisis communication theory. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16(2), 165–186. doi: 10.1177/089331802237233
- Coombs, W. T. & Holladay, S. J. (2008). Comparing apology to equivalent crisis response strategies: Clarifying apology's role and value in crisis communication. *Public Relations Review*, 34(3), 252-257. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2008.04.001
- Coombs, W. T. & Holladay, S. J. (2010). *PR strategy and application: Managing influence*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Daymon, C. & Holloway, I. (2002). *Qualitative research methods in public relations and marketing communications*. London: Routledge.
- Dean, D. W. (2004). Consumer reaction to negative publicity: Effects of corporate reputation, response, and responsibility for a crisis event. *Journal of Business Communication*, 41(2), 192–211. doi: 10.1177/0021943603261748
- Diana, A. (2011, January 12). Social media users expect rapid response to complaints. *InformationWeek*. Retrieved from <http://www.informationweek.com/news/smb/ebusiness/229000566>

- Dizastor. (2008, November 16). Controversial Motrin moms commercial [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BmykFKjNpdY>
- Dugan, L. (2010, August 10). 74 percent of us expect help when we SMS our distress: The Red Cross hopes to make this a reality. *Social Times*. Retrieved from http://socialtimes.com/red-cross-sms_b19696
- Dumenco, S. (2011). We said we were sorry on YouTube! What else do you want from us?! *Advertising Age*, 82(41), 20.
- Edwards, J. (2009, January 20). Worst Twitter post ever: Ketchum exec insults Fedex client on mini-blog. *CBS News*. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505123_162-42740256/worst-twitter-post-ever-ketchum-exec-insults-fedex-client-on-mini-blog/?tag=bnetdomain
- Evans, S. (2008, November 16). Motrin moms: Social media fail whale. *Mashable*. Retrieved from <http://mashable.com/2008/11/16/motrin-moms>
- Evans, D. C., Epstein, E., Carroll, A., Hora, J. & Moran, T. (2011). Using Twitter to reassure users during a site outage. *Psychster*. Retrieved from <http://udoc.eu/docs/e9bb1e/psychster-using-twitter-to-reassure-users-during-a-site-outage-microsoft-twitterstudy/?source=search>
- Fearn-Banks, K. (2010). *Crisis communications: A casebook approach* (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.
- Fereday, J. & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 1-11. Retrieved from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5_1/PDF/FEREDAY.PDF
- Fussell Sisco, H. (2012). Nonprofit in crisis: An examination of the applicability of situational crisis communication theory. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 24(1), 1-17. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2011.582207
- Gates, A. (2008, November 15). Motrin's new ad attacks babywearing, insults moms. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://crunchydomesticgoddess.com/2008/11/15/motrins-new-ad-attacking-babywearing/>
- Godin, S. (2008, November 17). We feel your pain. Retrieved from http://sethgodin.typepad.com/seths_blog/2008/11/we-feel-your-pa.html
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Harold, C. (2004). Pranking rhetoric: "Culture jamming" as media activism. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 21(3), 189-211.

- Health, R. L., & Coombs, W. T. (2006). *Today's public relations: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heussner, K. M. (2010, June 10). BP asks for disclaimer on fake Twitter account. *ABC News*. Retrieved from [http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Media/bp-asks-disclaimer-fake-twitter-account/story?id=10876379#](http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Media/bp-asks-disclaimer-fake-twitter-account/story?id=10876379#.TswUqxyPZwc). TswUqxyPZwc
- Horrigan, J. B., & Morris, S. (2005). Data memo. *Pew Internet and American Life Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/>
- Imperfectparent. (2008, November 18). A Motrin commercial alternative [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TpqpAGLS2t4>
- Jin, Y. & Liu, B. F. (2010). The blog-mediated crisis communication model: Recommendations for responding to influential external blogs. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22(4), 429-455. doi: 10.1080/10627261003801420
- Kayne, B. K. (2005). It's a blog, blog, blog, blog world. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 13(2), 73-95.
- Keane, M. (2008, November 25). Motrin's mommy headache: A lesson in social media experimentation. *Wired*. Retrieved from <http://www.wired.com/epicenter/2008/11/motrin-moms-a-1/>
- Kelleher, T. (2008). Organizational contingencies, organizational blogs and public relations practitioner stance toward publics. *Public Relations Review*, 34(3), 300-302. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2008.05.003
- Kent, M. L. (2008) Critical analysis of blogging in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 34(1), 32-40. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2007.12.001
- Kent, M. L. & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 28(1), 21-37. doi:10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00108-X
- Kitzinger, J., & Barbour, R. S. (1999). Introduction: The challenge and promise of focus groups. In R. S. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory and practice* (pp. 1-20). London: Sage.
- Krueger, R. A. (1998). *Moderating focus groups: Focus Group Kit 4*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Learmonth, M. (2008, November 17). How Twittering critics brought down Motrin mom campaign. *Ad Age*. <http://adage.com/article/digital/twittering-critics-brought-motrin-mom-campaign/132622/>

- Lindlof, T. R. (1995). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Liu, B. F. (2009). Distinguishing how elite newspapers and A-list blogs cover crises: Insights for managing crises online. *Public Relations Review*, 36(1), 28-34. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.10.006
- Liu, B. F. (2010). Effective public relations in racially-charged crises: Not black or white. In W. T. Coombs & S. J. Holladay (Eds.), *Handbook of crisis communication* (pp. 335-338). New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Liu, B. F., Austin, L. & Jin Y. (2011). How publics respond to crisis communication strategies: The interplay of information form and source. *Public Relations Review*, 37, 345-353. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.08.004
- Liu, B. F. & Kim S. (2011). How organizations framed the 2009 H1N1 pandemic via social and traditional media: Implications for U.S. health communicators. *Public Relations Review*, 37, 233-244. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.03.005
- Maresh, M. & Williams, D. E. (2012). Oil industry crisis communication. In W. T. Coombs and S. J. Holladay (Eds.), *The handbook of crisis communication* (pp. 285-300). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Markovsky + Company. (2006). 2006 State of corporate blogging survey. Retrieved from <http://kevin.lexblog.com/Makovsky2006StateOfCorporateSurvey.pdf>
- Marshall, C., & Rossman G. B. (2010). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Muralidharan, S., Dillistone, K., & Shin, J.-H. (2011). The Gulf Coast oil spill: Extending the theory of image restoration discourse to the realm of social media and beyond petroleum. *Public Relations Review*, 37(3), 226-232. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.04.006
- Muralidharan, S., Rasmussen, L., Patterson, D. & Shin, J. (2011). Hope for Haiti: An analysis of Facebook and Twitter usage during the earthquake relief efforts. *Public Relations Reviews*, 37(2), 175-177. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.01.010

- Neff, J. (2008, November 24). Crashing Motrin-gage: A social-media case study. *Advertising Age*. Retrieved from <http://adage.com/article/news/crashing-motrin-gate-a-social-media-case-study/132787/>
- NewBabyTV. (2008, November 16). Outraged baby-wearing momma responds to new Motrin campaign [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wFcKhv5O4zM>
- OrganicMania. (2008, November 16). Motrin®: I'm appalled. Retrieved from <http://organicmania.com/2008/11/16/motrin-i-m-appalled/>
- Oyer, S. (2010). Effects of crisis type and interactive online media type on public trust during organizational crisis. *Public Relations Journal*, 4(3), 1-23.
- Palen, L., Vieweg, S., Liu, S. B. & Hughes, A. L. (2009). Crisis in a network world: Features of computer-mediated communication in the April 16, 2007, Virginia Tech event. *Social Science Computer Review*, 27(4), 1-14. doi: 10.1177/0894439309332302
- Pew Internet & American Life Project. (2010). Web 2.0. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/topics/Web-20>
- Pew Research Center. (2011, August 26). 65% of online adults use social networking sites. Internet & American Life Project. Retrieved from <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2011/Social-Networking-Sites.aspx>
- Presnal, K. (2008, November 16). Motrin giving moms a headache. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.skimbacolifestyle.com/2008/11/motrin-giving-moms-headache.html>
- Procopio, C. H., & Procopio, S. T. (2007). Do you know what it means to miss New Orleans? Internet communication, geographic community, and social capital in crisis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35(1), 67-87. doi: 10.1080/00909880601065722
- Rød, S.K., Botan, C., & Holen, A. (2011). Communicating risk to parents and those living in areas with a disaster history. *Public Relations Review*, 37(4), 354-359. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.08.012
- Sanders, B. (2008, November 17). Babywearing moms mad at Motrin. *ParentDish*. Retrieved from <http://www.parentdish.com/2008/11/17/babywearing-moms-mad-at-motrin/>

- Schultz, F., Utz, S. & Göritz, A. (2011). Is the medium the message? Perceptions of and reactions to crisis communication via Twitter, blogs and traditional media. *Public Relations Review*, 37(1), 20-27. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.12.001
- Skimbaco. (2008, November 16). Motrin ad makes moms mad [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LhR-y1N6R8Q&feature=related>
- Smith, C. (2011, May 2). Osama bin Laden's death leaked via Twitter. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/02/osama-bin-laden-death-twitter-leak_n_856121.html
- Stelter, B. (2010, June 9). BP Account on Twitter? Just a joke; k thx bye. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/10/us/10twitter.html>
- Sweetser, K. D., & Lariscy, R. W. (2008). Candidates make good friends: An analysis of candidates' uses of Facebook. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 2(3), 175-198. doi:10.1080/15531180802178687
- Sweester, K. D., & Metzgar, E. (2007). Communicating during crisis: Use of blogs as a relationship management tool. *Public Relations Review*, 33(3), 340-342. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2007.05.016
- Taylor, M., Kent, M. L., & White, W. J. (2001). How activist groups are using the Internet to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 27(3), 263-284. doi:10.1016/S0363-8111(01)00086-8
- Taylor, Marisa. (2009, July 20). Mommy Bloggers Debate a PR Blackout. Retrieved from <http://blogs.wsj.com/digits/2009/07/20/mommy-bloggers-debate-a-pr-blackout/>
- Taylor, M. & Perry, D. C. (2005). Diffusion of traditional and new media tactics in crisis communication. *Public Relations Review*, 31(2), 209-217. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2005.02.018
- The New York Times. (2008, November 17). *Moms and motrin*. Retrieved from <http://parenting.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/11/17/moms-and-motrin/>
- TODAY staff. (2010, updated December 14). Ann Curry's Haiti tweet ranked most powerful of 2010. Retrieved from http://today.msnbc.msn.com/id/40645273/ns/today-today_celebrates_2010/t/ann-currys-haiti-tweet-ranked-most-powerful/
- Twitter Help Center. (2012). Parody, Commentary, and Fan Accounts Policy. Retrieved from <http://support.twitter.com/articles/106373-parody-commentary-and-fan-accounts-policy>

- Ulmer, R. R., Sellnow, T. L. & Seeger, M.W. (2007). *Effective crisis communication: Moving from crisis to opportunity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van der Wolf, M. (2007). The business value of blogging. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/66334/Business-value-of-blogging-Whitepaper-by-Lewis-PR>
- Weiner, B. (2006). *Social motivation, justice, and the moral emotions: An attributional approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wigley, S. & Fontenot, M. (2011). The Giffords shootings in Tucson: Exploring citizen-generated versus news media content in crisis management. *Public Relations Review*, 37(4), 337-344. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.07.004
- Wigley, S. & Zhang, W. (2011). A study of PR practitioners' use of social media in crisis planning. *Public Relations Journal*, 5(3), 1-16.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2001). *Writing up qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wright, D. & Hinson, M. D. (2011). A three-year longitudinal analysis of social and emerging media use in public relations practice. *Public Relations Journal*, 3(3), 1-32.