BUILDING TRUST IN TURBULENT TIMES: ORGANIZATIONAL TACTICS AGAINST DIGITAL MISINFORMATION.

BY

CHINOMSO JOY OBIOHA

ABSTRACT

In today's world, false information within the online space is a big problem for companies. It can hurt their reputation and the trust people have in them. This study examines the best ways for companies to address this problem. It suggests a method that combines preparing ahead of time (proactive trust-building) with reacting smartly to a crisis (reactive crisis response). The study used a mixed-methods approach. First, a survey was carried out to observe how building trust and reacting to a crisis affects a company's reputation. Second, interviews were held with 10 senior company leaders to understand how they use these strategies. The survey results showed that both building trust beforehand and reacting well during a crisis helped protect the company. Most importantly, the results showed that reacting well works much better when a company has already built a lot of trust. The interviews showed that top companies are moving from just reacting to problems to actively controlling their own story. They also said it is important for different departments in a company to work together. The study concludes that to survive online misinformation, companies must mix proactive and reactive plans. Leaders need to see trust as an important asset and change how their companies work to protect it.

Keywords: Misinformation, organizational trust, crisis communication, corporate social responsibility (CSR), and strategic integration.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The way we get information today is very fast and big, but it is also filled with what is called "information disorder." This includes misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation. These are now a serious threat to society and businesses. For companies, this problem is a real danger. It can cause them to lose billions of dollars in value in just a few minutes. It can destroy a reputation that took decades to build. It can break the trust they have with customers, employees, and investors. In this situation, companies cannot just react to problems as they happen. They need a better plan that is ready for the complex challenges of online information.

To fight this threat, it is important to understand the different types of false information.

- **Misinformation** is false information that is shared without the intention to cause harm. For example, a person might share a fake news story because they think it is real.
- **Disinformation** is false information created and shared on purpose to hurt a person, group, or company. This can be part of a planned campaign to achieve a goal, like making a company's stock price fall.
- **Malinformation** is information that is true but is shared out of context to cause harm. An example is leaking private emails to make someone look bad.

Understanding these differences is the first step for a company to defend itself. A simple mistake (misinformation) needs a gentle and educational response. A deliberate attack (disinformation) needs a much stronger crisis response, possibly with lawyers and security teams. Dealing with malinformation is the hardest because the facts are true, so the company must focus on explaining the context and managing its story.

Statement of the Problem:

Many studies have looked at how to deal with misinformation. Some studies focus on what to do after a crisis has already started. Other studies focus on long-term brand building. There is also a lot of research on the psychology of why people believe false information. However, these studies are often separate and do not connect these different ideas. There is no single, complete guide for companies that combines all these pieces into one clear plan. This study was done to fill this gap in knowledge by creating a single framework that puts together proactive (before the crisis) and reactive (during the crisis) strategies for companies.

Purpose of the Study:

The primary goal of this paper is to determine the best ways for organizations and businesses to build and keep the trust of their stakeholders when faced with online misinformation campaigns. This paper argues that reacting to a crisis and building a brand over the long term are not separate tasks; they must be connected and work together. This study aims to create a model that combines reactive crisis management strategies, such as prompt and clear responses, with proactive trust-building strategies, such as transparency and having strong social responsibility programs, so that organizations can proactively integrate these elements into their strategic planning. By doing so, they can ensure robust protection against misinformation attacks, thereby safeguarding their reputation and stakeholder trust.

Objectives of the study:

To achieve the goal of this study, the following objectives were created:

1. To understand if proactive trust-building strategies help a company stand strong against misinformation campaigns.
2. To determine the best reactive communication strategies for mitigating reputational damage in the event of a misinformation campaign.
3. To discover how businesses can best combine proactive and reactive strategies into a single, well-thought-out plan to preserve and restore stakeholder trust.

Research Questions:

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How much do proactive strategies (like transparent communication and CSR) help a company's resilience against digital misinformation campaigns?
2. What are the best reactive communication tactics (like speed of response and message framing) for reducing reputational damage during a misinformation event?
3. How can companies best combine proactive and reactive strategies into a single framework to protect stakeholder trust?

Hypotheses:

Ho1: Companies that are seen as having high levels of proactive trust-building will suffer less reputational damage after a misinformation event than companies with low levels of proactive trust-building.

Ho2: During a misinformation crisis, a quick, transparent response from a leader is better at protecting stakeholder trust than a slow or impersonal company statement.

Ho3: The success of a good reactive response is strongly influenced by the level of pre-existing proactive trust a company has built.

Scope of the Study

This study focuses on the strategies that organizations can use to fight digital misinformation. It examines both proactive methods, such as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), and reactive methods, like crisis communication. The study is limited to large, consumer-facing corporations, such as those in technology and retail, because these companies are often the targets of misinformation campaigns.

Significance of the Study:

Trust is very important for any company to succeed. This study looks at how companies can protect that trust in the age of fake news. By reading this research, company leaders can get ideas on how to make better decisions to protect their reputation. This study can also be used by future researchers as a resource because it helps fill a gap in what we know about this topic.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers separate problem information into three types based on the creator's intent: misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation. Misinformation is false, but it has no intent to hurt anyone. Disinformation is false information that is spread on purpose to trick or hurt someone. Malinformation is based on facts, but it is used in a way that hurts people.

This "information disorder" has a huge effect on businesses. A study from 2019 found that false information costs the world economy about $78 billion a year, mostly in stock market losses. In 2013, a fake tweet about explosions at the White House caused the stock market to lose $136 billion for a brief period. Beyond money, misinformation causes deep and lasting damage to a company's reputation. Interestingly, research shows that companies with very good reputations can be hurt the most by fake news. A lie about a company that is already seen as untrustworthy is not surprising. But a lie about a trusted company creates confusion and can cause a much bigger fall in public opinion.

In response, companies have developed several defense methods. These can be broken down into two main types: reactive and proactive. Reactive tactics are used during a crisis. They include monitoring social media to catch false stories early and responding very quickly with correct information. The most direct response is debunking or fact-checking the false claim. But just telling the truth may not be enough. Some people might not trust the company, or they might be stuck in their own "echo chambers" online, where they only hear opinions they already agree with.

Experts recommend proactive strategies to build resilience over time because of these limits. Brand journalism is one way to do this. A company tells its own story and shares its values all the time so that it has a good reputation before a crisis hits. Another proactive strategy is to build a network of brand advocates, such as loyal employees and customers, who can speak up for the company in a real way. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is an important proactive strategy. When a business really cares about doing the right thing and helping others, it builds a "trust reservoir" with the public. If stakeholders think a company is really responsible, they are more likely to believe it when it says something that is not true. But most of the research that is already out there looks at these proactive and reactive strategies separately. This study submits that they must be examined collectively to formulate a genuinely effective defense.

METHODOLOGY

Design:

This study employs a mixed-methods research design for data collection and analysis. This method employs both qualitative and quantitative approaches concurrently. It entails distributing surveys to obtain quantitative data and conducting brief interviews to gain more profound insights. The choice of a sample size of 60 survey participants was informed by a preliminary power analysis to ensure the sample is sufficiently robust to detect meaningful effects. Additionally, referencing past mixed-method studies indicates that this sample size is adequate for drawing valid conclusions in similar research contexts.

Area of Study:

The research examines the methods and approaches employed by large, consumer-oriented corporations to establish and safeguard stakeholder trust amid digital misinformation. This explains how these businesses get ready for and deal with information threats to see how these actions affect their reputation and how much people trust them.

Population:

The target population includes two groups. For the quantitative part, the population was general consumers who act as stakeholders for companies. For the qualitative part, the population was made up of senior executives, like Chief Communications Officers and CEOs.

Sample and Sampling Technique:

A sample size of 60 consumers was used for the survey. A random sampling technique was used to assign these participants to different experimental groups to make sure the results were fair and unbiased. For the interviews, a sample of 10 senior executives was used. A purposive sampling technique was used for the interviews to choose individuals with direct professional experience in managing misinformation crises, ensuring rich and relevant insights.

Instrument:

The study uses two main instruments. The first is a structured questionnaire to collect quantitative data on how different company actions affect trust and reputation. The second is an interview guide with semi-structured questions, which was used to explore deeper qualitative insights from the executives about their real-world challenges and successes.

Method of Data Collection:

Data was collected using questionnaires and interviews. The questionnaires were given to participants through an online survey platform, and interviews were conducted with executives.

Method of Data Analysis:

The quantitative data from the survey were analyzed using statistical analysis to measure the relationships between company strategies and stakeholder trust. The qualitative data from the interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis to find and interpret common themes and patterns related to the research questions.

RESULTS and FINDINGS

Research Question 1: How much do proactive strategies help a company's resilience?

Ho1: Companies that are seen as having high levels of proactive trust-building will suffer less reputational damage.

Table 1: Impact of Proactive Trust on Post-Crisis Reputation

Proactive Trust Condition	Average Post-Crisis Trust Rating (out of 7)	Percentage of participants willing to trust the company's denial
High Proactive Trust (History of CSR & Transparency)	5.8	78%
Low Proactive Trust (Neutral/Poor Record)	3.2	22%

Trust Rating (1-7): Participants rated their trust in the company after seeing the misinformation, with 1 being very low trust and 7 being very high trust.

Findings:

The results show that proactive trust-building has a very strong effect on a company's ability to withstand a misinformation attack. The company, with a history of being trustworthy, kept a much higher level of trust even after false information was shared about it. This supports Hypothesis 1: "Companies that are seen as having high levels of proactive trust-building will suffer less reputational damage".

Research Question 2: What are the best reactive communication tactics?

Ho2: A quick, transparent response from a leader is better at protecting trust.

Table 2: Impact of Reactive Response Quality on Post-Crisis Reputation

Reactive Response Quality	Average Post-Crisis Trust Rating (out of 7)	Perceived Effectiveness Rating (Compared to slow, generic response)
High-Quality Response (Rapid, from CEO)	5.1	65% more effective
Low-Quality Response (Slow, from company)	3.9	Baseline

Trust Rating (1-7): Participants rated their trust in the company after seeing its response, with 1 being very low trust and 7 being very high trust.

Findings:

The quality of a company's reaction to a crisis was found to have a major impact on stakeholder trust. A fast and personal response from the CEO was significantly more effective at protecting the company's reputation than a slow and vague corporate statement. This supports Hypothesis 2: "During a misinformation crisis, a quick, transparent response from a leader is better at protecting stakeholder trust".

Research Question 3: How can companies best combine proactive and reactive strategies?

Ho3: The success of a good reactive response is strongly influenced by pre-existing proactive trust.

Table 3: Combined Effect of Proactive Trust and Reactive Response

	High-Quality Reactive Response (Average Trust Rating)	**Low-Quality Reactive Response** (Average Trust Rating)
High Proactive Trust Company	6.5	5.1
Low Proactive Trust Company	3.7	2.7

Trust Rating (1-7): This table shows the average trust rating for each of the four experimental conditions, showing the interaction between the two factors.

Findings:

The most important finding was the interaction between proactive trust and reactive response. A good response helped both companies, but it was far more powerful for the company that had already built a high level of trust. For the low-trust company, even a great response was not enough to overcome the public's doubt. This supports Hypothesis 3: "The success of a good reactive response is strongly influenced by the level of pre-existing proactive trust a company has built". The findings from executive interviews also showed that the most successful companies intentionally break down the walls between their brand-building teams and their crisis-response teams, creating a single, integrated "Information Integrity" team.

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Discussions

Research Question 1: How much do proactive strategies help a company’s resilience?

The findings show that building trust is not just a "nice-to-have" public relations activity; it is a critical part of a company's defense system. When a company invests in real CSR and is transparent over many years, it builds what executives in the interviews called a "trust reservoir". This reservoir does not just act as a passive shield; it actively helps the company during a crisis by making its denials more believable and by creating a network of supportive stakeholders who are willing to defend it.

Research Question 2: What are the best reactive communication tactics?

While proactive work is vital, the way a company reacts in the first few hours of a crisis still matters a lot. A fast, honest, and personal response, especially from a trusted leader like the CEO, can stop the bleeding of trust. This is because it shows the company is taking the problem seriously and is not hiding anything. An impersonal and slow response, on the other hand, can be seen as defensive and can make the situation worse by allowing the false story to spread without being challenged.

Research Question 3: How can companies best combine proactive and reactive strategies?

The results strongly suggest that proactive and reactive strategies do not just add to each other; they multiply each other's effects. A great crisis response from a company nobody trusts is like a powerful engine in a car with no wheels; it won't get you very far. The pre-existing trust is what gives the crisis response power. The interviews with executives confirmed this from a practical side. They repeatedly mentioned that the biggest mistake companies make is separating their marketing and CSR teams (the trust builders) from their communications and legal teams (the crisis responders). The smartest companies have created unified teams to manage the company's story and reputation all the time, not just during a crisis. They have also shifted their mindset from disbelief with every false rumor to proactively flooding their minds with their own positive and authentic stories, making it harder for lies to stick.

Conclusion:

In today's information environment, where trust is easily broken, companies must adapt to survive. This study shows that being resilient to misinformation is not about one single tactic but about the deep combination of proactive trust-building and reactive crisis response. Proactive work like authentic CSR builds a reservoir of trust that makes a company's crisis communications much more effective when an attack happens. The main message of this paper is a call for leaders to break down the walls inside their organizations that separate long-term brand building from short-term crisis management. The companies that will win in this new environment are not the ones with the fastest reply, but the ones that have built such a strong foundation of trust that lies have nowhere to grow.

Recommendations:

1. Company leaders should treat investments in trust, like CSR and transparency programs, as essential business infrastructure, just as important as cybersecurity.
2. Organizations must create cross-functional teams that bring together people from communications, marketing, legal, and other departments to manage the company's reputation and information strategy as one unified effort.
3. Communication teams should move away from a defensive, reactive approach and instead focus on the strategy of telling their own authentic story to control the narrative.
4. Further research should be done to see if these findings apply to smaller businesses or organizations in different countries, where trust in companies and the media might be different.

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. (2023). *How and why does misinformation spread?* Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/topics/journalism-facts/how-why-misinformation-spreads

American Psychological Association. (2024). Misinformation and disinformation. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/topics/journalism-facts/misinformation-disinformation

Brennen, J. S., Simon, F. M., Howard, P. N., & Nielsen, R. K. (2021). Beyond (mis)representation: Visuals in COVID-19 misinformation. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 26(1), 277–299.

Cavazos, R. (2019). The Economic Cost of Fake News. University of Baltimore.

Cision. (2024). No April Fool's joke: How to combat misinformation and fake news around your brand. Retrieved from https://www.cision.com/resources/articles/no-april-fools-joke-how-to-combat-misinformation-and-fake-news-around-your-brand/

Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2022). The handbook of crisis communication. John Wiley & Sons.

Ecker, U. K., Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Schmid, P., Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N.,... & Amazeen, M. A. (2022). The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction.

Nature Reviews Psychology, 1(1), 13-29.

Edelman. (2024). *2024 Edelman Crisis & Risk Thought Leadership Report*.

Kapantai, E., Christopoulou, A., & Angeletopoulou, A. (2020). A systematic literature review on disinformation: Toward a unified taxonomical framework. *New Media & Society*, 23(5), 1301–1326.

Korteling, J. E., Gerritsma, J., & Toet, A. (2021). Cognitive biases are not to be blamed for everything. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 736801.

Malik, A., Asghar, M. Z., & Riaz, F. (2023). Antecedents and consequences of misinformation sharing behavior among adults on social media during COVID-19. *SAGE Open*, 13(1).

Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 188, 39-50.

Pérez-Escolar, M., Castro-López, A., & Alcolea-Díaz, G. (2023). A systematic literature review of the phenomenon of disinformation and misinformation. *Media and Communication*, 11(2), 76-87.

Shao, C., Ciampaglia, G. L., Varol, O., Yang, K. C., Flammini, A., & Menczer, F. (2018). The anatomy of an online misinformation network. *PloS one*, 13(4), e0196087.

Van der Linden, S. (2023). The Psychology of Misinformation. Cambridge University Press. 119

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146-1151.

Wang, D., Garcia, M., & Kim, Y. (2020). Exploring stakeholder perceptions of corporate reputation in the age of fake news: A qualitative analysis. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 23(1), 56-74.

Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking. Council of Europe report, DGI(2017)09.

World Economic Forum. (2024). *The Global Risks Report 2024*.

Zhang, X., & Ghorbani, A. A. (2020). An overview of online fake news: Characterization, detection, and discussion. *Information Processing & Management*, 57(2), 102025.