

Sample Chapter

Attack of the Customers

Why Critics Assault
Brands Online and
How To Avoid
Becoming a Victim

By Paul Gillin
with Greg Gianforte

AttackOfTheCustomers.com

Buy on Amazon:
bit.ly/AOTCBook

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the authors have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of its contents and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. Consult with a professional where appropriate. The authors shall not be liable for any loss of profit or any commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential or other damages. Do not read while operating heavy machinery. May cause agitation.

For questions about reprints, excerpts, republication or any other issues, send an e-mail to info@attackofthecustomers.com.

Copyright © 2012 Paul Gillin and Greg Gianforte

All rights reserved.

ISBN: 1479244554

ISBN-13: 978-1479244553

For Lillian and Blair

Contents

INTRODUCTION VII

CHAPTER 1: WHEN CUSTOMERS ATTACK 1

Attacks come from nowhere and strike even the biggest brands. Poor customer service is often the cause.

CHAPTER 2: HOW ATTACKS HAPPEN.....15

Analysis of three recent attacks shows the power of social media to both accelerate and distort their magnitude.

CHAPTER 3: STUDIES IN SOCIAL MEDIA CRI- SIS.....27

Learn from the experience of seven attack victims.

CHAPTER 4: WHY CUSTOMERS ATTACK.....46

The surprising truths about what foments customer dissatisfaction and why attackers can also be valuable allies.

CHAPTER 5: THE ATTACKERS.....59

The motivations, objectives and tactics of the four most common types of online assailant.

CHAPTER 6: ORDNANCE.....79

The eight major weapons in the online attacker's arsenal and how each is deployed.

CHAPTER 7: CUSTOMER AS CRITIC — THE POWER OF PEER REVIEWS.....104

Customer rating services are turning entire industries inside out. Here's how to work them to your advantage.

CHAPTER 8: MAINSTREAM MEDIA — ENA- BLER OR ENFORCER?.....120

The wounded giant is still a powerful amplifier, but traditional media increasingly takes cues from the crowd.

CHAPTER 9: AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION.....130

Active listening and influencer relations are your best strategies for staying out of trouble.

CHAPTER 10: HANDLING AN ATTACK.....150

What to do if your organization becomes a target.

CHAPTER 11: THE ATTACK-RESISTANT ORGANIZATION.....171

Eight rules for building a culture that loves its customers.

PARTING SHOTS.....205

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....208

INDEX.....210

FOOTNOTES.....220

Chapter 6: Ordnance

ord•nance (noun) \ 'ord-nən(t)s \ Military supplies including weapons, ammunition, combat vehicles, and maintenance tools and equipment.

— Merriam-Webster dictionary

Social media has unquestionably been the most potent driving force behind the growing incidence of customer attacks in recent years. Campaigns that once used to require armies of volunteers writing letters, lobbying media and organizing protests are now conducted with hash tags and Facebook pages. Petitions no longer have to be fielded in shopping malls; collecting signatures is as simple as convincing people to click a button. Critics can organize global campaigns without changing out of their pajamas.

We're still in the very early stages of understanding how this all changes relationships between organizations and their constituents. The new economies of scale and velocity require us to discard some old assumptions.

For one thing, the ease with which campaigns are organized today can make them look bigger than they really are. A decade ago, a petition with 50,000 signatures demanded attention. Today, the Change.org petition site hosts scores of active petitions that have many more signatures than that. Does today's online petition merit as much attention as one that was fielded with shoe leather and pencils just a few years ago?

Then there's the time factor. Because attacks can form so quickly, organizations under attack feel pressured to respond in kind, but decisions made in haste are rarely the best ones. Our expectations are rooted in a time when things unfolded much more slowly and raising one's voice required time and commitment. We assumed that a few vocal critics represented many more silent ones. Today, that may not be the case, but our response reflex hasn't yet adapted.

Finally, the rules of interaction have changed. Just five years ago it was almost unheard of for a company to invite its critics to vent their anger in an open forum bearing its brand. Today, that's the cost of being on Facebook. Few organizations are culturally prepared for this kind of transparency, but it's clear we're not going back to the old days. Complete openness demands that we change our assumptions about how we deal with our constituents.

Start by understanding the tools that critics use. An angry customer has an unprecedented arsenal of communications weaponry available, most of it at little or no cost. Each has its own strengths and weaknesses. In this chapter, we examine the tools that attackers use, running down the list in alphabetical order.

Blogs — They Still Matter

The most mature form of social media, blogs have found their niche as a long-form communications tool that's well suited to analysis and exposition. Some of the most famous customer attacks, including Jeff Jarvis' "Dell Hell,"¹ Vincent Ferrari's AOL cancellation² and Bob Garfield's "Comcast Must Die" started on blogs. However, recently the popularity of blogging has been eclipsed by social networks, which are simpler to use and come with a built-in audience.

Corporate blogging is in decline. The Center for Marketing Research at the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth documented a decrease in blogs maintained by both the Inc. 500 and Fortune 500 companies in 2011,³ the first downturn in the study's five-year history. However, declining corporate interest in blogs is probably due to the fact that it's simply easier to use Twitter or Facebook.

Among enthusiasts and professionals, blogs continue to serve a vital function. Technorati's 2011 State of the Blogosphere survey of more than 4,000 bloggers found that 45% of them have been blogging for more than four years and that the average blogger maintains three blogs.⁴ Forty percent of respondents said they blog more than three hours per week. Nearly 80% have a college degree.

In contrast to the idle chatter you find on Facebook or Twitter, blogs are usually serious discussion.

Seven in 10 survey respondents said they blog to gain professional recognition, and 68% said they do it to attract new business. More than two-thirds said they believe blogs are being taken more seriously as sources of information.

Blogs permit more creative latitude than any other medium, and they can be a pretty powerful tool in the hands of a good writer. For a lot of big brands, bloggers are now respected channels to their customers and are important sources of information. Among the brands that regularly host blogger events or have formal influencer relations programs are Procter & Gamble, General Mills, Molson, PepsiCo and Ford Motor Co. General Mills has a members-only club called MyBlogSpark.com, where invited bloggers can get inside information and early access to new products. Software giant SAP has hosted an international conference called the Influencer Summit for several years to cultivate technology bloggers.

Bottom line: Blogging has matured and so have bloggers. Today's bloggers are more committed, more serious and more knowledgeable than the dabblers of a few years ago. Blogs don't amplify an attack as much as social networks do, but they aggregate and analyze better than any other form of social media.

Blogs are also notable for their influence on mainstream media. Every major newspaper hosts contract bloggers, and major news sources such as The Huffington Post, TechCrunch, Daily Beast, Engadget, The Consumerist and The Politico are, in effect, built on blogging platforms or feature the work of prominent bloggers. Journalists looking for experts go first to Google, which favors bloggers for their focus and distinctive voice.

One individual with a blog can gain considerable prominence in a specific topic. For example, Paul has written a blog called Newspaper Death Watch, which chronicles the changes in the newspaper industry, since 2007. The site is a top Google result for many search terms related to the state of newspapers, and Paul has been interviewed or cited by *The New York Times*, *The Economist*, *The New*

Yorker, NPR, the Al Jazeera television network and many other outlets as a result. He gets a couple of inquiries a week from reporters or professional journalists seeking his opinion, and the site draws about 500 visitors a day, all because Google deems his content to be useful to his narrow readership. There are thousands of other examples just like this.

In certain industries, blogs are now seen as equivalent in influence to mainstream media. The annual BlogHer conference is a major venue for consumer packaged goods companies to announce new products and curry the favor of influential mom bloggers. General Mills has chosen diet blogger Lisa Lillien of Hungry-Girl.com to announce several of its new products. “She’s one of the most cogent voices in the weight management field,” said public relations manager David Witt.⁵

We hope we’ve made our point by now: Bloggers are a major factor to contend with, and in many industries we believe they deserve as much attention as mainstream news outlets. When they mass for an attack — as they did in the Motrin Moms or Komen for the Cure cases — they can catalyze other social media channels and legitimize an issue for mainstream media. Serious bloggers should be treated with respect and given access to your most knowledgeable people.

Change.org — Frictionless Protest

This online petition site has quietly become one of the Internet’s most influential voices for change, with membership expected to exceed 25 million by the end of 2012. Described as “one of the most influential channels for activism in the country” by *The Washington Post*, it is capturing the attention of everyone from presidents to PR people.

“[A]nyone, anywhere — from Chicago to Cape Town — can start their own grassroots campaign for change using our organizing platform,” Change.org says on its description page. “Your campaign can be about anything from supporting curbside recycling programs to fighting wrongful deportation to protecting against

anti-gay bullying.” The service is particularly popular in campaigns that involve the environment, human or animal rights, health and consumer advocacy. But some of its biggest successes have related to more prosaic causes, such as hidden fees or product ingredients. Change.org has been criticized for its business model, which sells petition signers’ e-mail addresses, but that doesn’t seem to be slowing its momentum.

There are several other online petition sites, including PetitionBuzz.com, Care2.com, iPetition.com and SignOn.org. However, Change.org has the most momentum. Starting a petition is as simple as filling out a short Web form, and about 10,000 new petitions are started each month. They range from popular political causes, such as ending human rights abuses in Myanmar, to highly localized and specific issues, such as a plea for the St. Michael Catholic Academy of Austin, Texas, to allow more students to use a shaded grassy area on hot days. Most petitions go nowhere, but a few attract significant attention.

The largest petition ever started on Change.org was filed by the parents of Trayvon Martin, the 17-year-old Florida youth who was shot and killed by a self-appointed neighborhood watch leader in February 2012. It amassed more than 2.3 million signatures in less than three months.⁶ Whether the petition played any role in the ultimate arrest of the shooter and resignation of the police chief in the case is hard to tell, but there’s no question that it was a catalyst for awareness.

Petition signers can easily notify their social networks of causes they support through automatic links to Facebook, Twitter and e-mail address books, and the site makes it easy to embed an advocacy badge on a website or blog. Change.org also has a detailed guide on how to promote petitions, including tips on the finer points of posting to Twitter and the basics of influencer relations.

Change.org maintains a running list of news stories related to its petitions, and the site stamps a “Victory” ribbon on those that succeed. Two of its most notable successes are Molly Katchpole’s protests against Bank of America and Verizon that we described in Chapter 5.

“The way forward is through better storytelling,” wrote Jonathan Alter in an essay about Change.org. “Online campaigns work best when they have narratives behind them — plucky stories of average people crowd-sourcing their way to power, as Katchpole did against Bank of America.”⁷ It so happens that mainstream media outlets look for some of the same features, which is why Change.org is a popular hangout for journalists.

There are no hard and fast rules for how to respond to a Change.org petition. Some drives have gathered more than 180,000 signatures and gone nowhere, while others have forced change with just a few thousand names. However, business leaders should be aware of the growing influence of the site and should keep a watchful eye on their Google Alerts for mention of their name or names of competitors with the Change.org domain. With plans to expand to more than 20 countries by the end of 2012, the site appears to be a force to be reckoned with for the long term.

Consumer Advocacy Sites

“Million-Miler Sues United For Being Downgraded To Second-Tier Status”

“Shuttered Best Buy Puts Illinois Town \$200K Deeper Into Debt”

“Walmart Store Has No Room for Veterans On Memorial Day Weekend”

“Many Insurers Changing Prescription Categories So Customers Pay More for Already Expensive Meds”

Readers of The Consumerist (Consumerist.com) may recognize those headlines as typical of the advocacy site, which has posted thousands of experiences submitted by its readers since late 2005. The four above all appeared on a single day: May 29, 2012.

The Consumerist is the best-known example of a genre of pro-consumer websites that includes titles like My3Cents.com, RipoffReport.com, FightBack.com and TheSqueakyWheel.com. In

its own way, each fights for the little guy in the ongoing battle against big-box retailers, airlines, fast food restaurants and other businesses people love to hate.

Most use the same formula: Consumers can submit stories about experiences they've had (usually negative), which are then categorized by industry or company. In some cases, facts are checked, but usually the site operators lack the resources to verify much. Liability is managed through disclaimers that put the onus of truth on the contributor.

One of the largest such sites — Ripoff Report — has actually turned disputes between consumers and companies into a revenue stream. The site has more than 675,000 consumer complaints in its database, and its policy is never to remove any of them. Companies that believe their reputations have been sullied can submit a rebuttal, but they also have the option to pay Ripoff Report to act as a mediator between complainant and accused. This policy is controversial, to say the least, but Ripoff Report has never shied from controversy. It's been sued dozens of times.⁸

Consumer advocacy sites have been around for more than a decade, but they were mostly ignored by businesses in their early years. All that has changed, though, as new word-of-mouth channels have emerged to amplify messages.

Ben Popken had a lot to do with that. The editor of *The Consumerist* from its early days until late 2011, he oversaw an evolution both in the site's advocacy role and in its responsibility to the brands it took on.

Now a Brooklyn, N.Y.-based freelance writer, he speaks of what he learned from his years as a consumer advocate. "People wanted to vent. They wanted to know there was somebody out there who wasn't a robot or a hold signal," he said. "We built an incredible community where a story might immediately draw dozens or hundreds of comments from others with advice."

At first, most brands reacted to *The Consumerist* with indifference, but that changed "because we were giving companies such a spank-

ing that they had to notice us,” Popken said. “Companies learned they couldn’t just sit around; they had to act quickly. Every company now seems to have someone who monitors Twitter or the Internet to put out fires before they become the next big story on Consumerist or NBC News.”

The Consumerist’s approach to its mission has evolved from the early days, when most reports were published with little verification. “As our reputation grew, we realized that if we were going to be taken seriously, we had to give [the companies people complained about] a sporting chance,” Popken said. Since its acquisition by Consumer Reports in 2008, The Consumerist has become more vigilant about verifying complaints and seeking response.

Popken is proud of The Consumerist’s role in breaking some major stories. It was the first site to draw attention to America Online’s famously high-pressure customer retention policies, and it published a well-regarded series of investigations into “cash for gold” operations that buy jewelry from desperate sellers at far less than market value.

The Consumerist coined the term “grocery shrink ray” to describe the practice by which some packaged food makers quietly reduce package size without changing price. It also invented the “executive e-mail carpet bomb,” in which consumers derive e-mail addresses of top executives from public sources and deliver large numbers of complaint letters directly to senior management. “It’s incredibly effective because the people at the top are often so disconnected from their customers,” Popken explained.

Perhaps the greatest endorsement for the value of unfiltered customer feedback as practiced by consumer advocacy sites is the Consumer Products Safety Commission (CPSC), which in early 2011 introduced SaferProducts.gov, a public database that publicizes complaints about safety problems involving any of the 15,000 kinds of consumer goods it regulates.

The respected government agency’s approach to quality control is strikingly similar to Ripoff Report’s. The CPSC doesn’t apply any formal review process to the reports consumers post. Companies

that disagree with reviews can post responses but not take down the original complaints. A spokesman said the service has been a valuable source of guidance to the agency in deciding which safety issues to pursue. “Consumers are helping us focus on those things that really matter to them,” said Alex Filip, deputy director of the Office of Communications.

Facebook — Prepare to Engage

Facebook is the place to be for most brands these days, but it’s also the place to be attacked. Many of the biggest social media-driven crises of the last few years have been driven, or substantially influenced, by Facebook.

As we noted in the introduction, Facebook can be a risky proposition. If you set up a page and permit visitors to post to it, be prepared for complaints. You’re a facilitator, not an editor, so don’t try to control what people say beyond the basic standards of decency.

A well-crafted Facebook policy is important to avoid the kind of no-win situation in which Nestlé found itself in the palm oil debacle detailed in Chapter 5. If your policy is to permit negative comments to stand, then be ready to accept the consequences. If you explicitly bar negativity, then you’ll have fewer fans and productive conversations with your customers. Censorship is an invitation to disaster. Successful brands have learned to not only live with complaints but embrace them in the spirit of improvement. They know that receptivity is good for their image.

Even if you don’t have a Facebook page, your brand may still be represented there. Critics can set up pages, too. While that isn’t necessarily a problem for you (there are hundreds of “Walmart sucks” pages, for example, but nearly all are empty), a lightly trafficked hate page can become a lightning rod when triggered by an event or negative news report. Facebook comments are a bounty for journalists who use them to seek quotable critics.

Each Facebook page has one or more administrators, some of them identified and some not. If a hate page pops up targeting your

brand, don't panic. It probably won't go very far. If you do notice regular activity, it's a good idea to attempt to contact the administrators. Let them know you're watching, and you might even befriend them.

Never threaten or lecture these people. You have no leverage over them, and anything you say is likely to be republished if it can embarrass you. Make an earnest attempt to establish a dialogue out of public view. If they decline to engage, find out everything you can about them in case you're ever forced into a confrontation.

The marketers at ChapStick evidently didn't learn from Nestlé's experience. In 2011, the lip balm maker launched an edgy ad campaign that included a photo of a woman searching behind her sofa, apparently for her ChapStick. The photo was taken from the rear, and some people considered the image to be sexist and demeaning. They took their protest to Facebook.

ChapStick — which ironically urges people to “be heard at Facebook.com/ChapStick” — deleted negative comments en masse, which only made things worse. “The image isn't even that big of a deal — it's ChapStick's reaction to the criticism that galls,” wrote Tim Nudd in an *Adweek* column headlined, “A Social Media Death Spiral.”⁹

ChapStick's formal apology, issued six days after the flare-up began, gave critics new ammunition. The message referred to some of the comments it removed as spam, which it defined as “multiple posts from a person within a short period of time.” This definition can also be applied to a vigorous conversation, so the crowd went wild again. “So, to those ChapStick fans whose comments were deleted — it was all your fault, you obnoxious, foul-mouthed, menacing spambots!” Nudd chided in *Adweek*.

The lesson: Have someone play the role of cynic and tell you how your statements can be used against you. Because your critics will do that if they can.

Don't expect to get air cover from the social network itself. Facebook's terms of service¹⁰ are good at covering issues of intellectual

property and privacy, but the social network stays away from First Amendment issues, libel and controversy. Its only relevant prohibitions in those areas are:

You will not bully, intimidate, or harass any user.

You will not post content that: is hateful, threatening, or pornographic; incites violence; or contains nudity or graphic or gratuitous violence.

You will not use Facebook to do anything unlawful, misleading, malicious, or discriminatory.

None of those prohibitions would have done Nestlé or ChapStick much good. When crises erupt in Facebook, it's because the situation *isn't* covered by standard disclaimers. With so little case study evidence to work from, communicators are pretty much making it up as they go along.

The best defense against an attack on your own Facebook page is to post a sub-page explaining your policies on appropriate content. Nestlé and Coca-Cola call this page “House Rules,” and McDonald’s labels it “Play Nice.” In most cases, the language merely restates existing Facebook policies, but some brands press the rules a bit more.

For example, BP America’s disclaimer says its Facebook presence is intended to “engage the public in an informative conversation about our efforts to meet growing energy demands around the world.” It further reserves the right to delete content that is “obscene, indecent, profane, or vulgar ... contain threats or personal attacks of any kind [or] are defamatory, libelous or contain ad hominem attacks.”¹¹ That gives BP pretty wide latitude to regulate discussion, since the definition of “ad hominem” is so broad. BP had better be careful, though. If it defines the term too broadly, it risks making ChapStick’s mistake of dismissing critics as spammers.

If you have to deal with a rebellion, treat everyone equally and don’t edit selectively. Take a page from what Lowe’s did in December 2011 when its Facebook page was swarmed over the retailer’s decision to pull its ads from a reality show about ordinary Mus-

lim families living in America. More than 9,000 comments were posted in 24 hours, many containing hateful language toward Muslims, and the attack generated widespread mainstream media coverage.

Lowe's chose to stay silent about the affair for a while, then it deleted the entire conversation and explained that the issue had gotten out of hand and that its Facebook page was not the appropriate place to discuss it. Fallout was minimal. Comments and media coverage were mostly favorable to Lowe's because the company didn't discriminate against any individual or group. It merely said the discussion should happen somewhere else.

The culture of Facebook assumes that conversation will be open and honest. If you approach Facebook expecting to control the conversation, be ready for trouble. If you're not ready to take a few arrows, then don't go there.

Hate Sites — Second Life from Search

Once a primary attack vector, hate sites have declined significantly in popularity as social networks have streamlined the process of building a destination and audience. Hate sites typically use a bastardized domain like USAirways-Sucks.com, GapSucks.org, IHateStarbucks.com and Iams-Cruelty.com, and feature news and forums that criticize the target company.

The problem with hate sites is that they require time and technical expertise to maintain, and their effectiveness depends upon search engine visibility and links from others. People who set them up often lose enthusiasm for the cause, leaving online ghost towns that haven't been updated in years. In contrast, Facebook comes with a lot of ready-made tools to build awareness, low administrative overhead and built-in community features. It isn't surprising that Facebook has displaced hate sites as a primary attack vector.

Because websites are more configurable than Facebook, some serve a purpose as a home base for campaigns whose principal activity has migrated to other platforms. An activist may post back-

ground documents, contact information, and press releases on a hate site and then take its active campaign to social networks.

Any company that's a candidate for attack should be sure to register variations of its domain that could potentially host hate sites. It's impossible to cover every base — the range of existing hate sites for just one airline include DeltaSucks, Delta'sTheWorst, NeverFlyDelta and DontFlyDelta — but the "IHate" prefix and "Sucks" suffix are obvious candidates.

Hate sites have one distinct advantage that can't be easily duplicated in other forums: search engine visibility. This can drive you crazy. A critical site that was abandoned years ago may show up on the first page of certain Google search results long after the original owners left town. Can you force hate sites off the front page of Google? Experts differ.

The issue of negative search engine optimization — sometimes called "Google bowling" — "is a highly debated question," said Mike Moran, co-author of *Search Engine Marketing, Inc.* "Some believe that it can work, and others don't."

The question is about how Google treats links from known spam sites or "link farms." These are clusters of websites set up by people who try to manipulate search engine results by creating a large number of essentially meaningless inbound links. Link quantity and quality are critical considerations in search rankings.

Search engines play a constant cat-and-mouse game with link spammers. They disregard links from known link farms, but new farms pop up every day, so it's hard for the search engines to keep up. We know that links from known link farms don't help a site's search visibility, but can they actually hurt? If so, then theoretically it would be possible to force a hate site down in search results by bombarding it with links from known link farms.

But Google isn't about to say whether that strategy would work. It doesn't want to give away any information to people trying to game the system. What we do know is that trying to elevate your own search visibility through link-farming is a losing game.

J.C. Penney was caught with its pants down in early 2011 when prominent search rankings for many of its domestic items drew the attention of SEO experts. It turned out that link farms were a critical factor, and Google promptly downgraded J.C. Penney by dozens of positions for many key terms. J.C. Penney maintained that it had no knowledge of the manipulation.¹²

Moran said the safer way to force detractors off the first page of search results “is to put out better content. It’s actually easier than ever to move bad things out because newer content has more impact than ever before.”¹³

Reddit — Explosive Potential

Have you ever heard of Reddit? We didn’t think so. Social news sites have never been high on marketers’ priority lists because of their reputation as being a playground for teen boys and nerds with few social skills. But that doesn’t make them any less influential as news amplifiers.

Consider these numbers: 3.5 billion page views, 43 million unique visitors and more than 4,000 active communities in August, 2012, according to the site. Internet news sites saw a 64% increase in referral traffic from Reddit between June and July of that year.¹⁴ Those statistics dramatize the amazing growth of this community that describes itself as “the front page of the Internet.”

Reddit’s star has risen as its predecessor, Digg, has faded. Both use a similar metaphor. Members submit links to pages, photos and videos they want to promote, and content rises and falls based upon votes by the members, or “redditors.” There are 25 main communities — give or take — and more than 67,000 sub-communities.

Reddit’s average member is a young male with some college education, and the site is particularly popular with techies.¹⁵ There are very few rules, which makes Reddit a magnet for profanity, vulgarity and childish behavior. However, there’s a lot of intelligent conversation that goes on there as well.

A particularly popular feature called “Ask Me Anything” allows anybody to promote their expertise, and celebrities, including Barack Obama, Jimmy Kimmel, Ron Paul and Stephen Colbert, have made guest appearances there to chat with members. On any given day, there are usually a couple of conversations going on with notable people.

To our knowledge, Reddit has not yet been a major contributor to a customer attack, but this site is growing fast and deserves attention. At its height in the early days of social media, Digg was capable of sending tens of thousands of visitors to a website in a matter of minutes. A negative customer story that hits the front page of Reddit can do the same. For now, redditors seem more interested in the cool and bizarre than in beating up on companies, but that could change.

Twitter — Attack Accelerant

“We’ve all heard that a million monkeys banging on a million typewriters will eventually reproduce the entire works of Shakespeare. Now, thanks to the Internet, we know this is not true.”

Berkeley professor Robert Wilensky uttered that memorable quote in 1996. Were he speaking it today, he might refer instead to Twitter.

Twitter is the enigma of social networks. It’s limited to text messages of 140 characters. It doesn’t support photos, videos or applications natively. Instead of friends, it uses the simpler connection metaphor of follower or subscriber. Even its website is so weak that only a minority of its members use it.

How does a service with so little going for it create so damn much trouble?

The answer lies just above the number 3 on your keyboard. The hash tag (#), which was created by the Twitter community to help bring order to the service’s inherent chaos, has become one of the Internet’s most powerful organizing and amplification tools. It has

helped Twitter become a core utility for arranging everything from book signings to mass protests. It has also established the popular microblog service as a prime channel for customer complaints and a favored tool of the critics we call “Casual Complainers.” The #fail tag, which denotes poor performance by a person or company, is monitored by millions and is not one you want to see next to your name.

More than five years after Twitter launched, we still hear questions all the time about its value. To the uninitiated, it’s a cacophony of voices sharing mostly useless information. And to a large extent that’s true. The low barrier to entry and ease of use are two of Twitter’s most endearing points. People can share anything, and they do. The power of Twitter comes from filtering out the junk and focusing on what’s important to you.

Twitter’s simplicity and accessibility are its strongest features. Messages can be sent and received on nearly any cell phone. Updates are instantaneous, which makes Twitter a valuable news tool. When seeking updates on a breaking news story, Twitter is often a much better source than the traditional media. Instead of relying on just one channel for information, you tap into the collective reports of many. Within a few seconds of news breaking anywhere, it’s on Twitter. People with large Twitter followings can quickly magnify a complaint with a single re-tweet, and the media have learned to use Twitter both as an amplifier and a leading indicator of developing news.

While Twitter has occasionally been used to originate major attacks, its 140-character message limit doesn’t permit much poetic license. Attackers are more likely to post their gripes on a blog or Facebook and use Twitter to extend their reach.

Twitter, Facebook, e-mail and other social networks are all amplifiers to some extent, but Twitter is unique in that its content is public. Facebook members share messages and links mainly with people they already know. In contrast, following a hash tag enables you to see all messages from all Twitter users about that topic. As a result, awareness can spread more quickly on Twitter than in any other social medium.

While the number of links shared on Twitter is less than one-third the number shared on Facebook, Twitter links are clicked on about 12% more often, according to a study by ShareThis, Starcom MediaVest Group and Rubinson Partners.¹⁶ Sharing a tweet with one's followers is a two-click process on most PCs and mobile devices. This ease of sharing is why Twitter's amplification power is so great. About 40% of messages on Twitter include a URL. This makes Twitter a rapid vehicle for spreading long-form content such as videos and blog posts.

Another distinguishing — if not unique — value of Twitter is its speed. Messages can be fired off in a few seconds and instantly reach a global audience. The combination of speed and hash tags has made Twitter an effective medium for managing crowds. During the Occupy Wall Street protests in New York in 2011, for example, the #needsoftheoccupiers tag made it possible for supporters to identify and respond to requests from protesters for everything from books to pizza.¹⁷ Organizers were able to move protests fluidly around the city by posting new locations to the #OWS tag.

Twitter has attracted an enthusiastic audience but not a very diverse one. The service is particularly popular with professional communicators, journalists, marketers, technology professionals and social media enthusiasts. Celebrities have embraced it as a way to connect directly with their fans (for example, more than 1,700 NFL players are on Twitter, according to Tweeting-Athletes.com), and media organizations have adopted it en masse to get bonus visibility for their coverage before it hits the newswires.

Acceptance by such visible people has perhaps made Twitter's influence disproportionate to its actual numbers. In fact, most Twitter members use the service very little. A 2009 study by Sysomos reported that 85% of Twitter users post less than one update per day, 21% have never posted anything and only 5% of Twitter users produce 75% of the content.¹⁸

However, even that small number can unleash an overwhelming amount of information. Dell Computer, for example, monitors about 25,000 messages per day in social media, most of them from Twitter, said Richard Binhammer, the former social media ambas-

sador at Dell Computer. Dave Evans, author of *Social Media Marketing: An Hour a Day* and vice president of social strategy at Social Dynamx sums it up: “When you really stare down the Twitter firehouse and see what’s coming at you, it’s scary.”

Bottom line: While Twitter may be small compared to Facebook, its vocal and influential member base can trigger a storm of controversy with amazing speed.

Twitter has played an amplification role in nearly every social media attack of the last four years. Journalists monitor trending hash tags to detect stories bubbling up through social media. Many create filtered tweet streams of the companies, government agencies and celebrities they cover. You should do the same for your company and brands.

Although major attacks rarely begin on Twitter, the service is a good way to identify problems before they get out of hand. One reason airlines watch Twitter so closely, for example, is that frustrated customers take first to their smart phones when delayed on the tarmac or frustrated at the ticket counter.

You’ve Been Hijacked

One unique form of Twitter attack is “brandjacking,” or false accounts that appear to be real. The critic may use an account name that’s substantially similar to a visible person or brand to post satirical or embarrassing messages.

The most notable example of Twitter brandjacking was @BPGlobalPR, which popped up during the 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico and began skewering BP as the company desperately struggled to stop the Deepwater Horizon disaster. The account attracted 160,000 followers — more than four times the following of BP’s real North American Twitter account — and generated huge amounts of media coverage. The fact that the author remained anonymous until months after the crisis contributed to public curiosity.¹⁹

A rogue employee at publisher Condé Nast created an account that relayed bizarre comments overheard in the elevator. @CondeElevator was quickly shut down but not before its follower count exceeded 80,000. A similar account about elevator gossip at Goldman Sachs (@GSElevator) was still active and being followed by more than 260,000 people as of this writing. It's doubtful the investment banker would want its customers to hear comments such as "Retail investors should be circumspect of any offering they're able to get their hands on. If you can get it, you don't want it," but private conversations like that are now public record.

Twitter has cracked down on parody accounts that deliberately misrepresent a brand, but the policy doesn't apply to individuals, and variations of brand names are still allowed. Celebrities such as Hosni Mubarak, Roger Clemens and William Shatner have been portrayed by fake Twitter accounts, and brand variations such as @ATT_Fake_PR and @FakePewResearch provide satirical and often very funny send-ups of their targets. If you've been brandjacked you can appeal to Twitter directly, but be prepared to wait. If the satirist works within Twitter's guidelines, you have to take a more conventional crisis management approach.

The best defense against a Twitter attack is to listen. Free Twitter clients such as TweetDeck and HootSuite do a good job of catching mentions of your brand or products. If the volume of mentions is large, or if you want to filter for sentiment to detect a surge in negativity, you'll need a paid listening tool such as Radian6, Lithium or Sysomos.²⁰ Listening is easy and low-risk, but think twice before you let your branded Twitter account wade into a conversation. The precedent you set may come back to haunt you when people begin to expect a response. Unless you're prepared to devote resources to engaging on Twitter every day, the safest course is just to keep your ear to the ground.

We can't think of a good reason why every company today shouldn't have a branded Twitter account. Even if you use it only to disseminate press releases, it at least plants a flag in this increasingly critical community and it acclimates you to the culture and style of Twitter participants. Knowing who's influential can help you get messages to the right people in the event of a crisis.

Many consumer-focused companies now use Twitter for front-line customer support. Twitter can be a great tool for such purposes, but be aware of what you're getting into. When you set the precedent of addressing complaints within hours or minutes, customers will come to expect the same service all the time. Failing to deliver it can create a problem. Listen for a while to get an idea of the magnitude of the support task you'll face, then staff appropriately. Once you start proactively addressing customer complaints in public, it's very difficult to go back.

YouTube — Attack TV

Video has a unique power to spark emotion, as it has done in everything from natural disasters to political campaigns to the Occupy Wall Street movement. With video cameras embedded in nearly every cell phone that's sold today, any moment is now a potential media moment. For better or for worse.

The rapid rise of YouTube as a cultural phenomenon has been stunning. In early 2012, video uploads to YouTube hit 72 hours per *minute*,²¹ a tenfold increase since 2007. As of this writing, YouTube was logging 4 billion video views per day and was the Web's number two search engine. With such vast reach, it's no surprise YouTube has also become a favored tool for attacking brands.

Some of the most notable YouTube attacks have used an organization's own collateral against it. The "Onslaught" TV ad produced by Unilever subsidiary Dove is a notable example. The 2007 ad chided the beauty industry for using images that taught young girls to equate self-esteem with physical appearance. It wasn't long before attack videos appeared that juxtaposed Onslaught with advertising for Unilever's Axe antiperspirant that featured scores of bikini-clad models.

Most people probably didn't know that Axe and Dove shared a corporate parent, and the spoof video, "A message from Unilever," ignited an unpleasant flurry of media criticism.²² "Only one in 100 people may know that Unilever owns both brands," said Jim Nail, who was chief marketing officer for media-monitoring service

Cymfony at the time. “But that one person is likely to be participating in social media.”

YouTube was the catalyst for 11 of 50 social media-inspired crises analyzed by Altimeter Group in a 2011 report. The attacks commonly take two basic forms:

Caught in the Act

These are embarrassing events captured by customers, usually on phone cameras, that demonstrate poor practices or customer service breakdowns. A 2007 video showing a dozen rats scurrying around a Greenwich Village Taco Bell embarrassed parent KFC and the New York Department of Health, which had passed the restaurant just a month earlier. KFC was forced to permanently close the store as well as nine others in New York City.

In December 2011, a U.S. resident’s security camera captured a 20-second clip of a Federal Express delivery man unceremoniously throwing a computer monitor over a 5-foot iron fence instead of delivering it to the front door. The video was viewed more than 2.4 million times on YouTube within 24 hours, and FedEx was forced to swiftly post an apology video. If you search for UPS, FedEx and other home-delivery services on YouTube, you’ll find lots of examples of drivers caught in traffic violations or mishandling customer deliveries.

There’s not much you can do to anticipate or defend yourself against those kinds of attacks except to have a crisis plan in place. Companies that have large customer-facing organizations are the most vulnerable, and leaders need to realize that these days their customer service reps are potentially their weakest link. Any interaction with a customer is a potential video or audio clip. Both candidates in the 2008 presidential election were embarrassed by comments caught on cell-phone cameras, and political action committees now routinely employ stalkers to follow opposing candidates and to exploit every opportunity to catch them in a misstatement or lie.

Block that Comment!

There isn't much you can do when bloggers gang up on your business or products, but at least you can prevent the negativity from spilling over onto your own blog, right? Um, not really.

While corporate blogging has declined somewhat with the rise of alternative platforms, the fact remains that 23% of the Fortune 500 and 37% of the Inc. 500 still maintain public-facing blogs, according to the Center for Marketing Research at the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth.²³ Many large companies have multiple blogs.

All blogging platforms support reader comments, although the feature can usually be turned off. Don't do that, though. Conversation is the essence of social media, and disabling comments turns a discussion into a monologue. You're better off having no blog at all, in fact, because restricting discussion makes you look clueless or arrogant. These days, critics simply take their gripes somewhere else.

It's better to post a "terms of service" statement in a separate page that outlines what you will and won't permit. Keep your list of prohibited content short and sensible: no offensive or hateful language, stalking, spamming, obscenity or intellectual property theft. We like the policy on General Motors' FastLane Blog.²⁴ It accepts the fact that dissent is part of an open discussion and it strives simply to keep the conversation civil.

We recommend against following the example set by Delta Airlines, whose user agreement runs to an incredible 6,600 words.²⁵ It's not surprising the Delta blog generates so little discussion. Anyone who would wade through such a ponderous legal document to post a comment would have to be very committed. Perhaps Delta's tome is a veiled message to critics to get lost.

The classic example of caught-in-the-act was the 2006 America Online incident we noted in the introduction. A recorded phone call of a customer service rep's overly aggressive efforts to retain a customer went viral and spread to national media in just five days.

AOL issued a formal statement saying the incident was an anomaly and that the rogue employee had been fired. It either didn't notice or ignored the fact that hundreds of people were lodging complaints about similar behavior in online forums. Then The Consumerist published an internal AOL document that proved that the rep's behavior was not only common but was actively encouraged by AOL management.

AOL shot itself in the foot. It had essentially sacrificed an employee for doing what he had been told to do, although perhaps a bit too enthusiastically. Its apology looked deceptive. No one was particularly surprised when AOL announced a few weeks later that it was getting out of the consumer Internet service provider business.

Spoofs

Sometimes a company's advertising messages can turn into parody videos that are meant to embarrass the firm or poke fun at its messages. These run the gamut from harmless to vicious, and responses must be tuned to avoid inflaming the situation further.

Spoofs can actually help boost brands, especially if they're creative and non-confrontational. Unilever has seen both sides of the issue. The "Onslaught" parodies cited earlier caught the company in an embarrassing double standard. However, an ad spot created in 2006 as part of the Dove Campaign for Real Beauty sparked several parody videos that enhanced the brand.

"Dove Evolution" depicted a rather plain-looking model being transformed into a billboard beauty thanks to makeup, professional photography and Photoshop. The ad, which was created exclusively for online presentation on a budget of only \$135,000, has garnered over 15 million views on YouTube as of this writing and won several awards.

A professionally produced parody called “Slob Evolution” emerged not long thereafter. It shows a handsome young man being transformed into an overweight oaf using the same techniques as the original Dove video. It was nominated for several awards, including an Emmy, and has been viewed over 1.5 million times. Other knockoffs featuring an Asian subject, a drag queen and even a pumpkin have also appeared, driving over 5 million views and helping to spread awareness of the original Dove campaign.²⁶

So, in the course of one year, Unilever experienced both the best and worst of what video parodies have to offer.

But not all parodies are so complimentary. Reports that the popular Chick-fil-A chain gave generously to anti-gay groups sparked a protest video in March 2012 that shows a trio of drag queens wallowing in sandwiches and waffle fries while singing, “Someday somebody’s gonna make you want to gobble up a waffle fry. But don’t go, don’t you know Chick-fil-A says you’re gonna make the baby Jesus cry.” (It sounds better than it reads.)

The “Chow Down (at Chick-fil-A)”²⁷ spoof crossed over 1 million views in the first six weeks and seems destined to become a viral classic. It also presaged a much bigger controversy that erupted over Chick-fil-A’s political leanings a few months later (see Chapter 10).

You need to walk a fine line when responding to spoof videos. One that doesn’t push an agenda is probably harmless and may even be helpful. Cadbury Schweppes’ innovative 2007 “Gorilla” campaign — which featured a character in a monkey suit drumming to Phil Collins’ song “In The Air Tonight” — spawned many imitators with the company’s tacit approval. “We feel that imitation is the most sincere form of flattery,” a spokesman told the U.K.’s *Birmingham Mail*. “It’s fine by us, and we will let it ride so long as it doesn’t get out of hand.”²⁸

However, parodies that use a company’s logo, theme music or advertising storyboard to its detriment can cross the line into brandjacking. That’s next to impossible to combat because once a video is on the Internet, it quickly gets copied and reposted else-

where. In 2010, Greenpeace created a gory parody of a Nestlé commercial for the Kit Kat candy bar showing an office worker biting into an orangutan's finger instead of a chocolate wafer. The video was a takeoff on an actual Kit Kat commercial and was intended to attack Nestlé's use of palm oil. Australia's *Daily Telegraph* but two years later copies were easy to find in several places, including on YouTube.

Index

#

#MotrinMoms hashtag, 18

@

@ATT_Fake_PR, 97
@BPGlobalPR, 96
@ChryslerAutos Twitter account, 158
@CondeElevator, 97
@FakePewResearch, 97
@Sweden Twitter account, 44, 45

9

90:9:1 rule, 110
9gag.com, ix

A

A Complaint Is a Gift, 21, 48, 138
 Eight Step Gift Formula, 49
A Grapefruit Matter, 27, 28
A.T. Kearney, Inc., 55, 135
ABC World News, 68
Abrahamsson, Sonja, 44
AdAge Digital, 117
AdBrite, 145
Adidas, ix
Advertising Age, 20, 36, 73
AdWeek, 88
Al Jazeera, 82
Alamo Drafthouse, 56, 57
Alexa, 45, 145
Allen, Jodi, 4
AlpacaDirect.com, 116
Altimeter Group, viii, 9, 52, 53, 99, 121, 126, 143, 152, 221
Amazon, 105, 108, 109

America Online, xi, 80, 86, 101, 120, 169
American Airlines, 72, 73, 74
American Customer Satisfaction Index, xiv, 136, 138
American Express, 50
 Global Customer Service Barometer, 137
American Society of Newspaper Editors, 124
Angie's List, 105
Apple Computer, 56, 207
 iPhone, 56
Arab Spring, vii
Arrington, Michael, 136, 140
AstroTurfing, 170
Atchison, Shane, 60
Aviva Insurance, 27, 28, 29
Aviva Insurance attack, 27–30
Axe deodorant, 98

B

Baldanza, Ben, 58
Baldwin, Alec, 40, 72, 73, 74
Bank of America, 67, 68, 70, 83, 84
Bank Transfer Day, 67, 70
Barlow, Janelle, 21, 48, 49, 55, 75, 138, 205
Barone, Lisa, 112
Bazaarvoice, 63, 110, 117, 118
Becker, Holly, 147
Bed Bath & Beyond Quirky, 195
Beef Products, Inc., 16, 22
BeefItsWhatsForDinner.com, 22
Berger, Jonah, 118
Bernanke, Ben, 142
Berra, Yogi, 57
Binhammer, Richard, xii, 95, 133
Birmingham Mail (UK), 102

- Bisphenol A, x, 166
 Blackshaw, Peter, 10, 62
 A Happy Customer Tells Three People, an Unhappy Customer Tells 3,000, 10, 62
 Blake, Trevor, 13
 Three Simple Steps: A Map to Success in Business and Life, 13
 BlogAds, 145
 Blogger Bob, 76, 77
 BlogHer conference, 82
 Blogs
 role in attacks, 80–82
 Boudreaux, Chris, 157
 boyd, danah, 143
 BP America, 89, 96, 154, 167
 British Broadcasting Corporation, 44, 137, 221
 Brown, Duncan, 143
BtoB magazine, 205
 Burger King, 154
 Burson Marsteller, 170
 Business Insider, 120
BusinessWeek, 123
- C**
- C.A.V.E. people, 63, 112
 Cadbury Schweppes, 102
 "Gorilla" ad, 102
 Captcha codes, 111
 Care One, 202
 Care2.com, 83
 CareerCast, 125
 Case Western Reserve University, 55
 Casual Complainers, 63, 64, 94, 132
 Cattlemen's Beef Board, 22
 Chadwick Martin Bailey, 113
 Change.org, x, 8, 67, 68, 79, 82, 83, 84
 role in attacks, 82–84
 Chaos Scenario, The, 73
 ChapStick, x, 88, 89
 Chartered Institute of Public Relations, 170
 Chevy Tahoe, 71
 Chick-fil-A, x, 102, 152, 170
 Chiquita, ix
 Boycott Chiquita - Support Ethical Oil, ix
 Chow Down (at Chick-fil-A), 102
 Christian, Kristen, 67, 68, 70
 interview with, 70
 Chrysler, 157
 CitySearch, 105
 Clemens, Roger, 97
 Clemons, Eric K., 109
 ClickFox, 11, 117, 173
 Customer service research, 11
Cluetrain Manifesto, vii
 CNN, 68, 166
 Coach, Inc., 64
 Coca-Cola, 89
 Colbert, Stephen, 93
 Collins, Phil, 102
 Colombo, Michelle, 113
Columbia Journalism Review, 121
 Columbia/HCA Healthcare, 128
 Comcast Corp., 73, 74, 80, 136
 @ComcastCares, 136
 Comcast Must Die, 73, 80
 Committed Crusaders, 63, 67, 68, 69, 72, 75, 76
 Compete.com, 145
 Condé Nast, 97
 Consumer advocacy sites, role in attacks, 84–87
 Consumer Products Safety Commission, 86
 SaferProducts.gov, 86
 Consumerist, The, 81, 84, 85, 86, 101, 117, 121, 200
 "executive e-mail carpet bomb", 86
 "grocery shrink ray", 86

evolution of, 85–86
 Convio, 9
 Craft Test Dummies, 139
 CraftCritique.com, 139
 Creative Connection blog, 139
 Credit Union National Association,
 68
 Cruisers, 1, *See* Procter & Gamble
 CuratorsOfSweden.com, 45
 Customer engagement strategies,
 198–99
 Customer Experience Scorecard,
 178–79
 Customer listening strategies,
 192–95
 Customer relationship
 management, 50, 174, 175,
 183, 194
 Customer self-service, 183–86
 Customer service on Twitter, 136–
 39
 Customer Service Scoreboard, 117
 Cymfony, 99

D

Daily Beast, 81
 Daily Beast, The, 24
 Daily News, New York, 127
 Daily Telegraph (Australia), 103
 Dan Rather Reports, 68
 Dave Carroll, xii, 50, 59, 60, 64,
 207
 DaveCarrollMusic.com, 59
 Davies, David-Michel, 9
 Decker, Sam, 62, 110, 117
 decor8blog.com, 147
 Deepwater Horizon, 96, 154, 167
 Dell Computer, Inc., xii, 72, 80, 95,
 117, 132, 133, 158
 Alienware, 133
 Ideastorm, 133, 195
 Social Media and Communities
 (SMaC) Certification, 158

Delta Airlines, 100
 Delta'sTheWorst, 91
 DeltaSucks, 91
 Dervin, Jenny, xiii, 64
 DHL, 205
 dietgirl.org, 146
 Digg, 92, 93
 Domino's Pizza, xiii
 DontFlyDelta, 91
 Dove, 98, 101, 102
 Campaign for Real Beauty, 101
 Evolution, 101
 Onslaught
 parodies, 101
 Onslaught TV ad, 98
 Slob Evolution parody, 102
 Dow Jones, 40
 DuPont, 129, 168
 Durgin Park, 56

E

eBay, 181
 Echo Research, 134
 EcoChildsPlay.com, 18
 Economist, The, 55, 81
 Edison Research, 138
*Eight to Great: Eight Steps to
 Delivering an Exceptional
 Customer Experience*, xv, 171
 Eliason, Frank, 136
 Eloqua, 148
 eMarketer, 17
 Engadget, 81
 Epinions, 105
 Evans, Dave, 96
 Eventbrite, 191
 Express Scripts, 35, 36
 Exxon Valdez, 154

F

Facebook, vii, viii, ix, x, xi, 6, 8, 9,
 22, 23, 24, 25, 41, 42, 50, 53,

55, 61, 67, 68, 70, 79, 80, 81, 83, 87, 88, 89, 90, 94, 95, 96, 106, 125, 128, 129, 131, 132, 135, 136, 137, 139, 144, 145, 148, 152, 155, 156, 159, 164, 170, 171, 185, 191, 205, 206, 221

Events, 191

role in attacks, 87–90

role in Komen for the Cure crisis, 24

role in Pampers Dry Max crisis, 2

role in pink slime crisis, 22

FactCheck.org, 124

Farle, Abby, 170

Farmer, Tom, 60

Federal Aviation Administration, 51, 72

Federal Express, 99, 169, 205

Federal Trade Commission disclosure standards, 150

Ferrari, Vincent, x, 80, 169

FightBack.com, 84

Filip, Alex, 87

Firmex, 160

First Call Resolution Rate (FCRR), 202

Fishburn Hedges, 134, 137

Fisher, Matt, 41

Flickr, 156

FM Global, 36, 39, 40

Transposition Error crisis, 39–40

For Immediate Release podcast, 24, 35, 36

Forbes, 109

Ford Motor Co., 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 81, 148, 151

Lessons from The Ranger Station attack, 32–37

The Ranger Station attack, 30–37

Forrester Research, 144

Fortune magazine, 40

Four stages of crisis, 162–69

Fox Business, 68

Fox, Paul (P&G), 2, 128, 163

FriendFeed, 28

G

GapSucks.org, 90

Garfield, Bob, 46, 73, 74, 80

Gartner, 109, 144, 191

General Mills, 81, 82

General Motors, ix, 71, 100, 154

FastLane Blog, 100

Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, 51

Gerber, Lisa, 155

Gianforte, Greg, 171

GigaOm blog, 140

Gillin, Paul, ii, xv, 104, 159, 209

Glassdoor.com, 105

Godin, Seth, 19, 143

Goldbach, Steven, 10

Goldman Sachs, 97

Good Housekeeping, 3

Google, 29, 40, 58, 81, 84, 91, 92, 105, 121, 127, 129, 130, 136, 139, 141, 145, 146, 155, 157, 160, 170

Alerts, 111

Google Trends, 15

Google+, 106, 108

negative SEO, 91–92

Gottlieb, Jessica, 17, 18, 19

Green Options, 17

Greenpeace, 54, 67, 68, 76, 103

H

Harvard Business Review, 118

Harvard Business School, 113

Harvard, Karl, 27, 28, 29

Hash tag, 18, 19, 37, 43, 93, 94, 136, 165, 191

Hate sites
 role in attacks, 90–92
 Hayes, Nick, 143
 Hayward, Tony, 167
 Hearst, William Randolph, 122
 Hill, Micarl, 110
 Hobson, Neville, 166
 Holiday, Ryan, 126
 Holm, Erik, 40
 Holmes, David, 51
 Holtz, Shel, 24
 HootSuite, 97, 158
 Huffington Post, 81, 120, 121, 123
 Huggies, x
 Hungry-Girl.com, 82

I

IamsCruelty.com, 90
 Ichinose, Stephanie, 107, 208
 IChooseWalgreens.com, 35
 IHateStarbucks.com, 90
 Indignant Influencers, 63, 72, 73,
 74
*Influencer Marketing: Who Really
 Influences Your Customers?*,
 143
 Influencer relations, 140–50
 Instagram, 156
 International Babywearing Week,
 18
 iPetition.com, 83
 Israel, Shel, 32

J

J.C. Penney, 92
 J.D. Power and Associates, 207
 Jack in the Box, 58
 Jarvis, Jeff, 72, 80
 JetBlue, xiii, xiv, 53, 64, 65, 207
 Valentine's Day crisis, xiii
 Johnson & Johnson, 17, 18, 19,
 20, 21, 25, 33, 151

Jordan-Meier, Jane, 163, 164, 167,
 168, 169

K

Katchpole, Molly, 67, 68, 83, 84
 Kawasaki, Guy, 207
 Keogan, Eva, 137
 KFC, 99
 Kimmel, Jimmy, 93
 Kit Kat, 103
 Kitchen Cabinet Reviews, 105
 Klout, 141, 142, 143, 145
 Kmiec, Adam, 35, 36
 Knowledge@Wharton, 138
 Kotecki, Erin, 20
 Kravitz, Noah, 37
 Kred, 141, 142
 Krejci, David, 162

L

L.L. Bean, 64
 LA Moms, 18
 Lacy, Sarah, 123
 Land's End, 64
 Lattin, Barb, 18
 Levi Strauss, 128
 Lillien, Lisa, 82
 LinkedIn, 37, 105, 149, 156, 159
 Lithium, 97
Los Angeles Times, 17, 68
 Lowe's Home Improvement, ix,
 89, 90
 Luca, Michael, 113
 Lucas, Frank (R-Okla), 39

M

Making Change At Walmart
 campaign, 71
 Malik, Om, 140
 Mandarin Oriental, 110
 Martin, Trayvon, 83

Maryland, State of
 insurance laws, 41

McDonald's, 35, 43, 63, 71, 89, 154
 "Play Nice" Facebook page, 89
 #McDStories hash tag, 42, 43

McKinsey Quarterly, 25, 138

McNeil Consumer Health Care, 18

Meatingplace, 16, 22

Meetup.com, 200

Merriam-Webster dictionary, 79

MF Global (not FM Global), 36, 39, 40

Micro Persuasion blog, 140

Microsoft Port25, 205

Microsoft SkyDrive, 160

Middleberg Communications, 125

Miller, Kivi Leroux, 23

Møller, Claus, 21, 48, 49, 55, 75, 138, 205

Molson, 81

Monitor, 10

Monty, Scott, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 128, 148, 160

Moran, Mike, 91, 146

Motrin Moms, 17, 19, 20, 17–20, 20, 21, 25, 33, 82
 Johnson & Johnson response, 19
 Lexalytics analysis, 20

Moyer, Michael, 109

MSNBC, 77

Mubarak, Hosni, 97

Mulally, Alan, 32

Multi-channel choice, 189–91

My3Cents.com, 84

MyBlogSpark.com, 81

MyStarbucks Idea, 195

N

Nadaraja, Nish, 113

Nail, Jim, 98

National Cattlemen's Beef Association, 22

National Lampoon, 17

National Public Radio, 68, 73

NBC News, 86

Nelson, Mickey, 118

Nescafé, ix

Nestlé, 68, 69, 87, 88, 89, 103

Net Promoter Score, 193

NeverFlyDelta, 91

New Influencers, The, x

New York Department of Health, 99

New York Times, The, 19, 24, 42, 81, 109, 118, 120

Newspaper Association of America, 124

Newspaper Death Watch, 81

Nielsen BuzzMetrics, 130

Nikon, 183

Nordstrom, 57, 188

NPR, 82

Nudd, Tim, 88

O

Oakes, Jim, 30, 31, 34

Obama, Barack, 93

Olive Garden, 113

Oliver, Jamie, 15

Outspoken Media, 112

Owyang, Jeremiah, 121, 126, 221

P

Pachomski, Jamie, 39, 40

paidContent.org, 43, 145

Paine, Katie, 20, 21, 128
 Measure What Matters, 20

Pampers, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 67, 128, 129, 221
 Dry Max, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 129, 221

Pampers bring back the OLD
 CRUISERS/SWADDLERS, 1–8,
 129

Paterno, Joe, 164

Paul, Ron, 93

PeerIndex, 141, 142, 143

Pennsylvania State University,
 164, 166

People for the Ethical Treatment
 of Animals (PETA), 76

PepsiCo, 81, 158

Pesta, Abigail, 24

PetitionBuzz.com, 83

Phonedog.com, 37

Pink slime, 15, 16, 20, 22, 26
 crisis, 15–17
 Crimson Hexagon report, 15
 United States Department
 of Agriculture, 15, 16

Pinterest, 139, 145, 149, 156

Pivot Conference, 135

Planet Feedback, 62

Planned Parenthood, 23, 24

Plebble, 28, 29

Popken, Ben, 85, 86, 121

Presnal, Katja, 18

Primack, Dan, 40

Procter & Gamble, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,
 7, 8, 81, 128, 151, 163, 221
 Baby Care Headquarters, 6
 Pampers Dry Max crisis, 1–8
 chemical burns, 3
 Consumer Products Safety
 Commission
 investigation, 221
 diaper rash, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6
 Flood the CPSC!, 3
 response strategy, 5
 slipstreaming, 1, 6, 7

Progressive Insurance, x, 41, 165
 crisis, 41–42
 Flo, 41, 42

Progresso Soup, x

Psychology Today, 47

Pulitzer Prize, 121, 123

R

Radian6, 97, 130, 132, 158

Reddit, 92, 93, 125, 152
 Ask Me Anything feature, 93
 role in attacks, 92–93

Ridge Tool Company, 195

RIDGID Forum, 195

RightNow Technologies, xi, xiv,
 11, 50, 60, 160, 184
 2011 Customer Experience
 Index Report, 50

Ripoff Report, 84, 85, 86, 117

Rohrs, Jenny Barnett, 139, 140

Rubel, Steve, 140

Rubinson Partners, 95

Ruggeri's restaurant, 57

Ruth's Chris, 58

Ryanair, 58

S

Saab, ix

SAP, 81, 135, 147, 195
 Influencer Summit, 81

Schneier, Bruce, 140, 141, 146

ScienceBlogs.com, 145

Scientific American, 109

Scoble, Robert, 140

Scobleizer blog, 140

Scribd, 61

Search Engine Marketing, Inc., 91

SeekingAlpha.com, 145

Shah, Rosana, 1, 8, 67

Shankman, Peter, 20

ShareFile, 160

ShareThis, 95

Shatner, William, 97

SignOn.org, 83

Silicon Valley Moms, 18

Skechers, 118, 119

Skinner, Jim, 63

- SlideShare, 27, 28, 29, 61, 145, 156
- Small Is the New Big*, 143
- Smith, Kevin, 72
- Snopes.com, 124
- Social Media Marketing: An Hour a Day*, 96
- Social Spark, 36
- socialmediagovernance.com, 157
- SocialMediaToday, 135
- Society of New Communications Research, 125
- sock puppetry, 170
- Solis, Brian, 143
- Somatica, 28
- Sons of Maxwell, 59, 60
- South by Southwest conference, 134
- Southwest Airlines, xi, xii, 51, 72
- Spiceworks, 105
- Spin Sucks Pro blog, 155
- Spirit Airlines, 58
- Spock.com, 149
- Spredfast, 158
- Sprint, 158
- Starcom MediaVest Group, 95
- Stewart, Martha, 139
- Super Size Me, 154
- Susan G. Komen for the Cure, 23, 25, 168
 crisis, 23–25
 Reaction to crisis, 24
 Global Race for the Cure, 25
- Sussin, Jenny, 109
- Sweden, country of
 tourism campaign, 43–45
- Sword Ciboodle, 135
- Sysomos, 95, 97, 131
- Szolnoki, Janos, ix
- T**
- Taco Bell, 99
- TechCrunch, 81, 121, 123, 136, 140
- Technorati, 80, 150
 2011 State of the Blogosphere survey, 80
- Teflon, 129, 168
- Teleflora, 117
- Temkin Group, 174
- TGI Friday's, 113
- The Daily, 15
- The Four Stages of Highly Effective Crisis Management*, 163
- The New Yorker*, 82
- The Politico, 81, 125
- The Ranger Station, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 128, 160
- The Straight Dope, 124
- TheSqueakyWheel.com, 84
- ThinkJar, 135
- Thumbtack, 105
- Time* magazine, 20, 25, 68, 123
- TMZ, 125
- Trapani, Gina, 140
- TripAdvisor, 65, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 193
- Trust Me, I'm Lying: Confessions of a Media Manipulator*, 126
- TrustPilot, 117
- Tumblr, 41, 42
- Tweet, xiv, 8, 18, 30, 31, 33, 37, 94, 95, 96, 125, 134, 136, 138, 140, 157, 191
- TweetDeck, 97
- Tweeting-Athletes.com, 95
- Tweetmeme, 28
- Twitter, vii, viii, xi, xiv, 9, 10, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 57, 72, 80, 81, 83, 86, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 125, 126, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 145, 148, 152, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161, 165, 166, 171, 191, 221

#ComcastSucks hash tag, 136
 #fail hash tag, 94, 200
 #needsoftheoccupiers hash tag, 95
 fail whale, 57
 Promoted trends (sponsored hash tags), 43
 re-tweet, 31, 165
 role in attacks, 93–98
 role in FM Global transposition error crisis, 39
 role in Motrin Moms crisis, 18
 role in pink slime crisis, 22
 role in Southwest Airlines attack, 72
 role in The Ranger Station attack, 31, 33
 Twitterfall, xiv
 Twitvite.com, 191
 Types of attacker
 Casual Complainers, 63–65
 Committed Crusaders, 67–72
 Extortionists, 65–67
 Indignant Influencers, 72–74

U

U.S. Department of Agriculture, 15, 16
 U.S. House of Representatives
 Committee on Agriculture, 39
 U.S. Transportation Security Administration, 76, 77, 78
 counter-attack strategy, 76–78
 Unilever, 98, 101, 102
 United Airlines, xii, 50, 59, 60, 64, 73, 84, 207
United Breaks Guitars, xii, 60, 73
 United Food and Commercial Workers, 71
 University of Massachusetts,
 Dartmouth
 Center for Marketing Research, 80, 100

University of Melbourne
 Customer service in retail survey, 13
 UPS, 99, 205, 206
USA Today, 19, 61, 127
 USAirways-Sucks.com, 90

V

vBulletin, 195
 Verizon Corp., 68, 83
Village Voice, 70, 127
 Virginia Tech, 166

W

Walgreens, 34, 35, 36
 #ILoveWalgreens hash tag, 35, 36
 Express Scripts attack, 35–36
Wall Street Journal, *The*, 19, 40, 42, 120, 127, 142, 221
 Walmart, xi, 4, 57, 71, 84, 87
 Get Satisfaction feedback page, xi
Washington Post, 82, 120
 Webby Awards, 9
 Weber Shandwick, 161, 162
 Firebell crisis simulation, 161, 162
Weekly World News, 120
 Weinbaum, Tammy, 51
 Weisenthal, Joe, 120, 223
 Wharton School, 118
 White, Nicole, 76, 77
 Widmer, Kathy (McNeil Consumer Health Care), 18
 Wikipedia, 70, 123, 170
 Wilde, Oscar, 45
 Wilensky, Robert, 93
 Winch, Guy, 46
 Wion, Rick, 43
Wired magazine, 71
 Witt, David, 82

Wittenborn, Dirk, 118
Word of Mouth Marketing
 Association
 Guide to Disclosure in Social
 Media Marketing, 157
Wright, Scott, 104, 194
Wyndham Wingate, 104, 194

Y

Yelp, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 113,
 136
York, Dan, 23

YouGov, 42
Yours is a Very Bad Hotel, 61
YouTube, 18, 51, 57, 60, 61, 98,
 99, 101, 103, 132, 139, 145,
 149, 156, 168, 181
 "caught in the act" attacks, 101
 role in attacks, 98–103
 spooof attacks, 101–3

Z

Zenofsky, Steve, 40
Zoominfo.com, 149

About the Authors



Dana Gillin photo

Paul Gillin is a writer, speaker and online marketing consultant who specializes in helping businesses use content to reach customers. A popular speaker and writer, he has addressed more than 100 groups and published more than 150 articles since 2008. He is a veteran technology journalist with more than 25 years of editorial experience, including 13 years exclusively online.

His books include *The New Influencers*, *Secrets of Social Media Marketing*, *The Joy of Geocaching* (co-authored with wife Dana) and *Social Marketing to the Business Customer* (co-authored with Eric Schwartzman). Paul is a columnist for *BtoB* magazine and a director of the Society for New Communications Research. His blogs are PaulGillin.com and NewspaperDeathWatch.com.



Greg Gianforte has started five successful software companies. He founded RightNow Technologies in 1997 with a mission to rid the world of bad experiences. The company enjoyed 15 years of continuous growth. At the time of its sale to Oracle in 2011, it had more than 2,000 large customers, 1,100 employees and \$225 million in annual revenue.

Among his many awards are Ernst & Young's Pacific Northwest Entrepreneur of the Year and the Leader Award from *CRM* magazine. he was inducted into the CRM Hall of Fame in 2007.

His books include *Bootstrapping Your Business* and *Eight to Great: Eight Steps to Delivering an Exceptional Customer Experience*.

Footnotes

¹ Jeff Jarvis, who instigated “Dell Hell” in 2005, recapped the story two years later in “Dell Hell: The end?” October 18, 2007, <http://buzzmachine.com/2007/10/18/dell-hell-the-end/> (accessed July 21, 2012).

² This story is told on Google Blogosoped: “Vincent Ferrari, One of the New Influencers,” June 4, 2007, <http://blogosoped.com/archive/2007-06-04-n80.html> (accessed July 21, 2012).

³ Barnes, Nora Ganim and Ava M. Lescault, “The 2012 *Inc.* 500 Social Media Update: Blogging Declines As Newer Tools Rule,” University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth, <http://www.umassd.edu/cmr/studiesandresearch/2012inc500socialmediaupdate> (accessed July 21, 2012).

⁴ “State of the Blogosphere 2011,” Technorati, November 4, 2011, <http://technorati.com/social-media/article/state-of-the-blogosphere-2011-part1> (accessed July 21, 2012).

⁵ Gillin, Paul, “General Mills’ Blogger Relations Program Follows the Golden Rule,” paulgillin.com (blog), July 29, 2010, <http://support.awarenessnetworks.com/Main/content/?id=6920619875995272388&type=post&uid=9130202349092311122> (accessed July 21, 2012).

⁶ Martin, Tracy and Sybrina Fulton, “Prosecute the killer of our son, 17-year-old Trayvon Martin,” Change.org, April 11, 2012, <http://www.Change.org/petitions/prosecute-the-killer-of-our-son-17-year-old-trayvon-martin>, (accessed July 21, 2012).

⁷ Alter, Jonathan, “For Change.org, a Better World Is Clicks Away,” Bloomberg View, March 8, 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-03-09/for-change-org-better-world-is-clicks-away-commentary-by-jonathan-alter.html> (accessed July 21, 2012).

⁸ Rip-off Report’s quirky founder, Ed Magedson, appears to revel in controversy. He cheerfully tells inquiring reporters how many times he’s been

sued while also pointing out that no action has yet been successful. His policy of not removing critical reviews has drawn considerable fire, but Magedson stands behind it. A page on the site titled “About Us: Want to sue Ripoff Report?” runs to more than 8,000 words and includes an analysis of the Communications Decency Act, among other things. A 2007 feature article in the *Phoenix New Times* has considerably more detail at <http://www.phoenixnewtimes.com/2007-02-01/news/the-real-rip-off-report> (accessed July 21, 2012).

⁹ Nudd, Tim, “ChapStick Gets Itself in a Social Media Death Spiral,” *Adweek*, October 26, 2011, <http://www.adweek.com/adfreak/chapstick-gets-itself-social-media-death-spiral-136097> (accessed July 18, 2012).

¹⁰ The terms are visible at <http://www.facebook.com/legal/terms>

¹¹ http://www.facebook.com/BPAmerica/app_6009294086

¹² Segal, David, “The Dirty Little Secrets of Search,” *The New York Times*, February 12, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/13/business/13search.html> (accessed July 15, 2012).

¹³ Moran explored negative SEO in more detail on his blog in “What Google Could Do to Stop Negative SEO,” http://www.biznology.com/2008/03/what_google_could_do_to_stop_n

¹⁴ Warzel, Charlie, “BuzzFeed Report to Publishing Partners Demonstrates Power of Social Web Reddit generates huge referral traffic while Pinterest falls flat,” *Adweek*, August 29, 2012, <http://www.adweek.com/news/technology/buzzfeed-report-publishing-partners-demonstrates-power-social-web-143194> (accessed September 6, 2012).

¹⁵ Wikipedia contributors, “Reddit,” Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Reddit&oldid=510945758> (accessed September 6, 2012).

¹⁶ “ShareThis and Starcom MediaVest Group Collaborate to Release First Comprehensive Study on Sharing,” ShareThis press release, June 6, 2011, <http://blog.sharethis.com/2011/06/06/sharethis-and-starcom-mediavest-group-collaborate-to-release-first-comprehensive-study-on-sharing> (accessed July 18, 2012).

¹⁷ *Occupying Wall Street: The Inside Story of an Action that Changed America* (New York and London: OR Books, 2011) p. 156.

¹⁸ Cheng, Alex and Mark Evans, "An In-Depth Look Inside the Twitter World," Sysomos Resource Library, June 2009, <http://www.sysomos.com/insidetwitter> (accessed July 21, 2012).

¹⁹ The author turned out to be Josh Simpson, a 26-year-old aspiring comedian from Los Angeles whose career has no doubt been boosted at BP's expense.

²⁰ There are scores of these tools on the market but few comprehensive ratings guides. Two places to look are Bulldog Reporter's PR Monitoring & Measurement Software Buyer's Guide (<http://www.bulldogreporter.com/2012-pr-monitoring-buyers-buyers-guide-comparison-chart>) and the Social Media Monitoring Category of TopTen Reviews (<http://social-media-monitoring-review.toptenreviews.com/>). Be careful when relying on Google search for evaluations because the market changes rapidly and many top Google results are three or more years old.

²¹ "Holy Nyans! 60 hours per minute and 4 billion views a day on YouTube," The Official YouTube Blog, January 23, 2012, <http://youtube-global.blogspot.com/2012/01/holy-nyans-60-hours-per-minute-and-4.html> (accessed July 21, 2012).

²² Neff, Jack, "Dove Viral Draws Heat From Critics," *Advertising Age*, November 26, 2007, <http://adage.com/article/news/dove-viral-draws-heat-critics/122185> (accessed July 21, 2012).

²³ Barnes and Lescault, "The 2012 *Inc.* 500 Social Media Update."

²⁴ "Terms of Service," GM Fast Lane Blog, http://fastlane.gmblogs.com/?page_id=1486 (accessed July 21, 2012).

²⁵ "User Agreement," Delta blog, <http://blog.delta.com/user-agreement> (accessed July 21, 2012).

²⁶ "Evolution (advertisement)," Wikipedia, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution_\(advertisement\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution_(advertisement)) (accessed July 21, 2012).

²⁷ Philips, Wilson, “Chow Down (at Chick-fil-A),” <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sO-msplukrw> (accessed July 21, 2012).

²⁸ “‘Chow Down (At Chick-Fil-A),’ Wilson Phillips Drag Spoof, Parodies Fast Food Chain’s ‘Anti-Gay’ Controversy.” The Huffington Post, March 19, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/19/chow-down-at-chick-fil-a-wilson-phillips-drag-spoof_n_1365170.html (accessed July 21, 2012).