



RESEARCH ARTICLES
ДОСЛІДНИЦЬКІ СТАТТІ

<https://doi.org/10.17721/CIMC.2026.40.8-20>

From Reaction to Position: A Framing Model of Brand Responses in the Digital Environment

Viktoriia Nikytenko

Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman, Ukraine

This study examines public brand responses in the digital environment as a form of strategic communication based on framing rather than as isolated reactive actions. Drawing on framing theory and contemporary research in crisis and reputational communication, the article assumes that the systematic use of stable response frames enables organizations to manage reputational tension and maintain communicative subjectivity under conditions of continuous public visibility on social media. **Method.** The empirical material consists of anonymized public interactions between a Ukrainian brand with international presence and its audiences on social media platforms, including responses to comments from end consumers, professional communities, and B2B stakeholders. Using a qualitative, inductive research design, the study applies framing analysis to retrospectively collected practice-based data. Communicative stimuli were classified, and recurring logics of public responses were reconstructed and conceptualized as strategic response frames. **The results** identify several recurrent types of public inquiries that generate reputational tension, such as misinformation, delegitimization attempts, emotional dissatisfaction, integrity-related doubts, and demands for authenticity and transparency, and demonstrate a stable correspondence between these inquiry types and dominant response frames. The findings indicate that public responses function not only reactively but also as sense-making mechanisms that structure the interpretive field around the brand. The study contributes to crisis and strategic communication theory by extending event-driven reactive models toward a continuous framing perspective and offers practical implications for developing internal response protocols and communication playbooks in high-visibility and reputation-sensitive digital contexts.

Keywords: strategic communication, framing analysis, digital crisis communication, social media responses, reputational management

Citation: Nikytenko, V. (2026). From Reaction to Position: A Framing Model of Brand Responses in the Digital Environment. *Current Issues of Mass Communication*, 40, 8–20.
<https://doi.org/10.17721/CIMC.2026.40.8-20>

Copyright: © 2026 Viktoriia Nikytenko. This is an open-access draft article distributed under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY)**. The use, distribution or reproduction in other forms is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted if it does not comply with these terms.



Від реакції до позиції: фреймова модель відповідей бренду в цифровому середовищі

Вікторія Нікитенко

Київський національний економічний університет імені Вадима Гетьмана, Україна

У статті публічні відповіді бренду в цифровому середовищі розглянуто як форму стратегічної комунікації, засновану на фреймінгу, а не як ізольовані реактивні дії. Спираючись на теорію фреймінгу та сучасні дослідження кризової й репутаційної комунікації, авторка виходить із припущення, що систематичне використання сталих фреймів відповіді дає змогу організаціям управляти репутаційною напругою та зберігати комунікаційну суб'єктність в умовах постійної публічної видимості в соціальних медіа. **Метод.** Емпіричний матеріал становлять анонімізовані публічні взаємодії українського бренду з міжнародною присутністю з різними аудиторіями в соціальних мережах. Використовуючи якісний, індуктивний дизайн дослідження, автор застосовує фреймовий аналіз до ретроспективно зібраних даних, заснованих на практиці. Комунікативні стимули були класифіковані, а повторювані логіки публічних відповідей були реконструйовані та концептуалізовані як фрейми стратегічних відповідей. **Результати** визначають кілька повторюваних типів публічних запитів, які породжують репутаційну напругу, такі як дезінформація, спроби делегітимізації, емоційне невдоволення, сумніви, пов'язані з чесністю, та вимоги до автентичності та прозорості, і демонструють стабільну відповідність між цими типами запитів та домінуючими фреймами відповідей. Результати показують, що публічні відповіді функціонують не лише реактивно, але й як механізми сенсотворення, що структурують інтерпретаційне поле навколо бренду. Дослідження робить внесок у теорію кризових та стратегічних комунікацій, розширюючи реактивні моделі, керовані подіями, до перспективи безперервного фреймінгу та пропонує практичні наслідки для розробки внутрішніх протоколів реагування та комунікаційних схем у високо видимих та чутливих до репутації цифрових контекстах.

Ключові слова: стратегічна комунікація, фрейм-аналіз, цифрова кризова комунікація, відповіді в соціальних мережах, управління репутацією

The digital communication environment has fundamentally transformed the interaction between organizations and audiences, making it continuous, public, and multi-layered. In social media, any brand message – whether a reply to a comment, a clarification, a rebuttal, or an explanation – extends beyond an individual dialogue and becomes part of an open public space. Under these conditions, organizational responses no longer function solely as customer service tools; they increasingly serve as mechanisms for managing reputation and building trust in contexts of heightened informational tension.

Contemporary research on strategic and crisis communication on social media emphasizes that the effectiveness of organizational responses depends not only on their timeliness or formal correctness, but also on their ability to stabilize interpretations of events for a broader audience and mitigate reputational risks (Larisu & Zulham, 2024; Başaran, 2024). A number of empirical studies demonstrate that reactive or fragmented responses, constructed according to the logic of individual customer support, fail to produce long-term trust-preserving effects in digital environments, where messages are easily replicated, decontextualized, and reappropriated by other actors within the communication environment (Zhaldak & Kozii, 2024).

A distinctive feature of digital communication is the coexistence of diverse communicative stimuli within a shared public space, including factual inquiries, emotionally charged complaints, and destructive messages intended to discredit organizations or disseminate misinformation.

Nikytenko Viktoriia  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7399-6556>

This article was prepared as part of the author's independent research on strategic and crisis communication in the digital environment. The study is not related to any registered departmental research topic, grant-funded project, or externally funded program. The empirical material was collected from publicly available social media data and anonymized in accordance with ethical research standards. The dataset has not been made publicly available. The author declares no conflict of interest. The research was conducted at the author's own expense.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Viktoriia Nikytenko,
nikytenko.viktoriia@kneu.edu.ua



Syntheses of recent research in digital crisis communication indicate that standardized response templates do not account for this heterogeneity and may exacerbate reputational tension or lead to a loss of organizational subjectivity (Abiodun & Nwabueze, 2025). Consequently, there is a growing need for structured response models that allow differentiation among types of communicative challenges and enable the deliberate adjustment of response logic, tone, and content.

From a theoretical perspective, this issue aligns with framing theory, which posits that communication does not merely transmit information but actively constructs interpretive frames that determine which aspects of a situation become salient to audiences. In digital communication, brand responses function as frames that either stabilize public interpretation or, conversely, deepen interpretive uncertainty. However, most existing studies focus on general principles of crisis response, leaving operational framing models suitable for systematic application in everyday digital interaction largely underexplored (Bielecka & Feifei & Strzelecki, 2025).

The purpose of this article is to develop a framing model of organizational strategic response on social media, conceptualizing it not as an isolated reaction but as a tool for managing reputational tension and trust. Specifically, the study aims to: (1) typologize communicative stimuli in an organization's digital interaction with audiences; (2) describe the behavioral principles underlying strategic response; (3) identify structural response frames and define their functions within the public communication environment; and (4) construct a generalized model linking zones of reputational tension with communicative response frames.

This study contributes to the literature by conceptualizing organizational responses on social media as elements of strategic communication with a framing structure that stabilizes public interpretation. The proposed model also offers practical guidance for developing internal response protocols and communication playbooks in domains characterized by high public visibility and reputational sensitivity.

Method

Research Design

The study adopts a qualitative, methodologically oriented design aimed at identifying and conceptualizing recurring logics of strategic organizational responses in digital media. The methodological foundation is inductive framing analysis, which is widely used in studies of crisis and reputational communication on social media to reconstruct the meaning-making processes and strategic structures underlying public responses (Coombs & Holladay, 2021; Abboodi & Pileggi & Bharathy, 2023; Abiodun & Nwabueze, 2025).

Unlike studies based on pre-constructed datasets, this research draws on a retrospective analytical systematization of materials derived from professional practice in strategic communication. This approach is consistent with practice-based research, in which analytical models emerge from practical decision-making rather than being imposed *ex ante* (Cornelissen, 2020; Heide & Simonsen, 2022).

Research Material

The study is based on a corpus of public digital interactions between an organization and its audiences on social media platforms. These interactions emerged through routine communication practice and include responses to user comments that varied in communicative intent and levels of reputational tension.

For the purposes of this study, the material was retrospectively collected, systematized, and anonymized. A structured list of examples used in the analysis is provided in Appendix A (description of the analytical material) and Appendix B (table of anonymized public interaction examples). These appendices provide illustrative evidence and support the transparency of the research procedure.



Anonymization involved removing organization names, product identifiers, personal data, and other elements that could directly identify a specific brand. This approach is consistent with ethical recommendations for the use of practice-based cases in qualitative communication research (Heide & Simonsson, 2022).

The case presented in this study was not selected as an isolated or arbitrary example. Rather, the analytical model was developed through an iterative examination of multiple communication cases derived from professional practice.

Throughout this process, recurring response logics were identified, compared, and refined across different organizational contexts. The selected case represents an analytically illustrative example in which these logics appear in a consistent and systematic form, allowing their conceptual reconstruction.

This approach follows the principle of theoretical saturation in qualitative research, whereby a case is selected for detailed analysis once the core analytical categories have demonstrated stability across observations.

In addition to the focal case, elements of the proposed model were observed in other communication contexts, including development sector communication and public sector interaction. These contexts differ in stakeholder structure, institutional constraints, and reputational dynamics, and therefore provide additional settings for assessing the broader applicability of the identified response logics. This approach ensures that the identified response frames are grounded in recurring communicative patterns rather than derived from a single empirical instance.

Analytical Procedure

The analytical procedure comprised three consecutive stages.

First, communicative stimuli to which the organization responded publicly were classified into three broad categories: factual inquiries, emotionally charged complaints, and destructive or discrediting messages. This initial classification provided the basis for subsequent inductive coding, through which more specific empirical categories of public inquiries were identified (see Table 1). This categorization is consistent with contemporary approaches to digital crisis communication analysis, in which the type of communicative stimulus determines the permissible boundaries and logic of the response (Coombs & Holladay, 2021; Abboodi & Pileggi & Bharathy, 2023).

Second, a qualitative analysis of public responses examined the presence of explanation or argumentation, articulation of organizational position, management of emotional tension, reliance on facts or principles, and the strategic role of the response within the public communication environment. The analysis extended beyond linguistic characteristics and centered on the functional role of responses as elements of strategic communication (Cornelissen, 2020).

Third, inductive framing analysis was used to generalize recurring response logics into analytical frames. The frames were constructed through comparative analysis of responses and by correlating stimulus types with response characteristics. This inductive approach facilitates the identification of stable communication models that may serve as theoretical instruments for further research or as practical response protocols (Abiodun & Nwabueze, 2025).

Analytical Categories

The analysis employed the following analytical categories: type of communicative stimulus, response function, dominant response frame, response tone, and strategic role within the public communication environment. Together, these categories enabled responses to be examined not as isolated utterances but as elements of an integrated system of strategic communication in the digital environment.



Results

Empirical Context of the Case Analysis

The results are based on the analysis of public digital interactions of a Ukrainian brand with an international presence, operating in a highly competitive consumer market segment and maintaining consistently high public visibility on social media. The case involves regular public interaction between the brand and diverse audience groups, including end consumers, professional communities, and B2B partners.

A key feature of the case is the brand’s consistent practice of responding publicly to critical inquiries rather than redirecting communication to private channels. As a result, a stable corpus of publicly accessible responses has accumulated over time, providing an empirically relevant basis for examining structured reputational interaction in digital public discourse.

Another distinctive feature of the case is that the brand’s public responses demonstrate a stable internal logic that does not vary depending on platform, wording of the inquiry, or emotional intensity of the comment. This allowed the responses to be analyzed not as a set of reactions but as a coherent system of authorial response frames that emerged through communication practice.

Types of Public Inquiries and Reputational Tensions

The analysis of public comments and inquiries showed that they are neither random nor purely situational. Instead, recurring types of public inquiries emerge across different events and platforms, forming a structured field of reputational tension.

Inductive coding identified five primary empirical categories of public inquiries (Table 1).

Table 1. *Types of Public Inquiries and Reputational Tensions in the Analyzed Case*

Type of inquiry	Characteristics	Reputational risk
Reputational attacks and misinformation	Delegitimizing statements without intent for dialogue	Erosion of trust, normalization of suspicion
Integrity doubts	Criticism of terms, pricing, or bonus mechanisms	Undermining perceptions of fairness
Emotional dissatisfaction	Public complaints about interaction experience	Rapid escalation of negativity
Requests for authenticity and transparency	Questions regarding origin and standards	Delegitimization of value claims
Professional and B2B criticism	Evaluation of the brand’s strategic logic	Loss of trust among key stakeholders

As shown in Table 1, most inquiries are directed not toward resolving operational issues but toward evaluating the brand as an ethical, competent, and responsible actor. This confirms that public digital interactions function primarily as mechanisms of reputational pressure rather than merely as feedback channels.



Authorial Response Frames as an Empirical Outcome

Further analysis demonstrated that the brand's responses are neither situational nor intuitive. Instead, a stable system of meaning-making frames recurs across responses to different inquiry types and remains independent of the specific wording of individual comments.

These frames were not predefined as a theoretical model. Rather, they were reconstructed inductively through comparative analysis and conceptualized as authorial response frames – stable patterns for constructing public responses that perform a strategic function of shaping public interpretation.

The inductive analysis identified seven recurring strategic response frames within the analyzed case (Table 2).

Table 2. Authorial Response Frames Identified in the Analyzed Case

Authorial technique	Frame structure	Types of inquiries	Reputational function
3R	Reality → Decision → Resource	Misinformation, reputational attacks	Restoration of the factual frame; legiti- macy maintenance
Not → But	Refusal of imposed claim → Alternative logic	Delegitimization, stigmatization	Reframing interpretation; shifting salience
Q–A–Angle	Question → Answer → Positional emphasis	Critical public evaluations	Position articulation; boundary setting
Expectation → Context → Benefit	Acknowledge expect- ation → Explain conditions → High- light advantage	Integrity doubts	Rationalization of de- cisions; reduction of perceived unfairness
Concern → Care → Invitation	Validate emotion → Provide support → Open dialogue	Emotional dissatisfaction	De-escalation; relationship repair
Myth → Fact → Expansion	Identify misconcep- tion → Provide evi- dence → Systemic perspective	Authenticity and transparency requests	Explanatory legitimation; interpretive stabilization
Anti-justification	Refusal to defend → Calm declaration	Reputational attacks	Preservation of sub- jectivity; avoidance of defensive posture

Correspondence Between Inquiry Types and Response Frames

Comparative analysis revealed a consistent correspondence between types of public inquiries and dominant response frames (Table 3). Frame selection depended not on the emotional intensity of the inquiry or the communication platform but on the underlying type of reputational tension.



While Table 1 presents the primary empirical categories of public inquiries identified through the initial coding process, Table 3 presents their analytical reconstruction through framing analysis. At this stage, several empirically distinct inquiry types were consolidated according to their dominant reputational logic. For example, professional and B2B criticism was incorporated into the broader category of critical public evaluations, whereas different forms of symbolic discreditation were conceptualized as delegitimization and stigmatization.

Professional and B2B criticism was grouped under critical public evaluations because, despite involving different stakeholder groups, both categories challenge the organization's strategic decisions and therefore require responses that articulate and defend the organization's position rather than address service-related issues.

Table 3. Correspondence Between Analytical Types of Public Inquiry and Dominant Response Frames

Type of public inquiry	Dominant frame
Reputational attacks and misinformation	3R / Anti-justification
Delegitimization and stigmatization	Not → But
Critical public evaluations	Q–A–Angle
Integrity doubts	Expectation → Context → Benefit
Emotional dissatisfaction	Concern → Care → Invitation
Authenticity and transparency requests	Myth → Fact → Expansion

This correspondence suggests that, in the analyzed case, public responses perform not only a reactive function but also a sense-making function by shaping public interpretation of the brand in the digital communication environment.

Illustrative Examples of Response Frames

To enhance the analytical transparency of the proposed model, several anonymized examples of public interactions are presented below. These excerpts illustrate how the identified response frames operate in practice. The examples are illustrative rather than exhaustive and demonstrate the recurring response logics reconstructed through inductive framing analysis (Table 4).

Table 4. Illustrative Empirical Examples of Public Inquiries, Organizational Responses, and Reconstructed Response Frames

Response frame	Anonymized public inquiry	Excerpt of organizational response	Analytical interpretation
Reality → Decision → Resource	“This brand still operates in Russia”	The brand does not operate in the aggressor state and has no business relations with it. Relevant documentation confirming this position is available on the official website	The response does not engage in emotional rebuttal or adopt a defensive stance. Instead, it restores the factual frame by sequentially clarifying the facts, stating the



			organization's position, and referring to verifiable evidence. This illustrates the <i>Reality → Decision → Resource</i> response frame
Not → But	This brand is all about marketing	Rather than relying solely on marketing, the brand invests in explaining its product formulations and maintaining an ongoing dialogue through skin-care experts	Instead of denying the criticism, the response redirects audience attention to the communicative value of expert knowledge
Expectation → Context → Benefit	I collected bonus points but cannot spend them although I want to	The bonus programme is intended to complement purchases rather than replace them completely. Customers can accumulate points and redeem them for full-size products	The response acknowledges the customer's expectations, explains the organization's policy, and concludes by emphasizing the benefits available to the customer rather than defending the policy itself
Concern → Care → Invitation	The product arrived hot. How can I know it wasn't damaged?	The products undergo stability testing at elevated temperatures. However, if you have any concerns, please contact us, and we will verify the product batch	The response acknowledges the customer's concern before providing a technical explanation and inviting further dialogue, illustrating a relationship-oriented communication approach
Myth → Fact → Expansion	Why is the brand described as Swiss if manufacturing is in Italy?	Brand identity is determined not only by the location of manufacturing but also by development standards, quality control, and international collaboration	The response replaces a simplified assumption with a broader explanatory frame, shifting interpretation from geography to organizational standards
Q–A–Angle	Isn't this brand mostly about marketing rather than product quality?	Yes, we invest heavily in communication because we believe that an effective product should also be easy to understand. Our goal is to explain complex formulations in a way that enables people to make informed choices. Our team includes scientists, dermatologists, cosmetologists, and communication special-	Rather than rejecting the criticism, the response first acknowledges the premise of the question, then provides a direct answer, and finally uses the interaction to reinforce the brand's strategic position. The response frame extends beyond resolving the immediate issue by emphasizing the orga-



		lists who work together to translate scientific expertise into accessible knowledge	nization's broader communication philosophy. This illustrates the <i>Q-A-Angle</i> response frame, in which a public inquiry becomes an opportunity to articulate the organization's identity and strategic positioning rather than merely defend against criticism
--	--	---	---

These representative examples illustrate how recurring communicative situations gave rise to the reconstructed response frames. Together, they provide empirical support for the analytical correspondence between inquiry types and framing logics presented in Table 3.

Reputational Effects of Framed Responses

The results indicate that systematic use of authorial response frames enables the brand to maintain its independent communicative position under conditions of sustained public tension. Public responses not only mitigate individual reputational threats but also establish a reproducible logic of reputational interaction that helps stabilize public interpretation of the brand.

Discussion

Relating Authorial Frames to Crisis and Strategic Communication Theory

The findings of this study demonstrate that public organizational responses in digital environments can be conceptualized as framing mechanisms selected according to the type of reputational tension rather than as isolated reactions to individual comments. The empirical analysis revealed a consistent correspondence between different categories of public inquiries and distinct authorial response frames, indicating that organizations rely on stable communicative logics when managing reputational challenges.

This relationship is particularly evident in responses to reputational attacks and misinformation. For example, when the organization was accused of operating in Russia, the response did not engage in emotional rebuttal or defensive argumentation. Instead, it restored the factual basis of communication by clarifying the organizational position, presenting the relevant decision, and referring to documentary evidence. This recurring communication logic was reconstructed as the **Reality** → **Decision** → **Resource** frame, whose primary function is not to persuade the original commenter but to stabilize interpretation for the wider observing audience.

These findings allow the authorial response frames to be situated within broader contemporary theories of crisis and strategic communication. In classical models – particularly Situational Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT) – the central focus is on aligning the type of crisis with an appropriate response strategy (Coombs & Holladay, 2010). Such approaches primarily conceptualize public responses as reactions to discrete events that have already occurred.

In contrast, the authorial frames identified in this study are not tied to specific crisis events. They operate as a continuous system of meaning-based responses that can be applied in crisis contexts as well as in pre-crisis or routine reputational situations. This makes it possible to conceptualize them not merely as tools of crisis suppression but as mechanisms for shaping public interpretation in digital communication.

Accordingly, the proposed frames extend the logic of SCCT toward proactive reputational subjectivity, in which organizational responses not only mitigate negative effects but also construct



stable expectations regarding organizational reasoning, decision-making, and public accountability.

Authorial Frames as a Response to the Limitations of Reactive Models

The empirical material demonstrates that most reputational interactions in digital communication are not triggered by discrete crises but by recurring communicative tensions. The analyzed inquiries were predominantly associated with delegitimization, critical public evaluations, emotional dissatisfaction, integrity doubts, and requests for authenticity rather than acute crisis events. These patterns suggest that organizations increasingly operate under conditions of continuous reputational exposure. This tendency is illustrated by the **Q–A–Angle** frame. Rather than rejecting criticism that the brand was "mostly about marketing," the organization acknowledged the premise of the question before explaining why communication itself constituted part of its strategic value proposition. Instead of resolving a single interaction, the response articulated the organization's philosophy and reinforced the brand's identity in public communication environment.

Research on digital crisis communication emphasizes that social media have altered the nature of crises by making them prolonged, fragmented, and continuously reproduced (Austin et al., 2012; Eriksson & Olsson, 2016). The findings of the present study empirically support this observation. Rather than encountering isolated crises, the analyzed organization continuously managed dispersed forms of reputational tension through recurring framing logics. Unlike reactive strategies described in prior literature, techniques such as **Reality → Decision → Resource, Myth → Fact → Expansion**, and **Q–A–Angle** enabled the organization to maintain a stable communicative position without repeatedly shifting into defensive communication. This finding aligns with contemporary approaches to strategic communication that prioritize consistency and intelligibility of meaning over speed of response (Cornelissen, 2020).

Framing Responses as a Form of Strategic Subjectivity

The findings indicate that the identified response frames perform a broader function than audience appeasement or issue resolution. Across different categories of public inquiries, the analyzed responses consistently shaped public interpretation by defining which aspects of the interaction were communicatively relevant. The response frames therefore functioned as mechanisms of organizational subjectivity rather than merely as techniques of emotional neutralization.

For example, responses to emotionally charged customer complaints consistently followed the **Concern → Care → Invitation** frame. Rather than immediately explaining organizational decisions, the responses first acknowledged the customer's concern, then provided factual clarification, and finally invited further dialogue. Similarly, the **Myth → Fact → Expansion** frame transformed isolated accusations into broader explanations of organizational standards and quality principles, thereby shifting attention from individual claims toward systemic understanding.

These findings resonate with recent studies noting the decreasing effectiveness of defensive justification in environments characterized by information overload (van der Meer & Jin, 2020). However, the present study extends this argument by demonstrating that organizations maintain subjectivity not through avoiding criticism but through the consistent framing of public interpretation.

Theoretical Contribution and Practical Implications

The findings of this study suggest that the principal contribution of the proposed model lies not merely in identifying recurring response-framing techniques but in establishing a systematic relationship between distinct types of reputational tension and corresponding framing logics. The empirical analysis demonstrated that different categories of public inquiries – including reputational attacks, delegitimization, critical public evaluations, emotional dissatisfaction, integrity doubts, and requests for authenticity – were consistently associated with particular response



frames. This correspondence indicates that response framing operates as a structured decision-making mechanism rather than as a collection of isolated communication techniques.

The proposed model therefore introduces an intermediate analytical layer between general communication strategy and individual message production. Rather than prescribing specific linguistic formulations, it explains how organizations can select appropriate framing logics according to the communicative function required in a given reputational situation. In this sense, authorial response frames represent operational principles of strategic communication rather than fixed response templates.

From a practical perspective, the findings demonstrate that communication teams can use response frames as analytical tools for developing communication playbooks, organizational response protocols, and internal training systems. Because the model is based on the logic of reputational tension rather than industry-specific cases, it allows organizations to maintain consistency while adapting message content to different audiences and communication contexts. Such an approach reduces the likelihood of contradictory public messaging and strengthens organizational coherence in digitally mediated communication.

Preliminary Analytical Validation Across Communication Contexts

Although the empirical model was developed from the analysis of consumer communication, its analytical applicability was subsequently examined across additional communication contexts characterized by different stakeholder expectations and institutional constraints. This comparative observation was not intended as formal validation but rather as an exploratory assessment of the transferability of the proposed framing logic.

The comparison suggested that the structural relationship between reputational tension and response framing remained stable despite substantial differences in communicative environments. In development-sector communication, for example, response frames comparable to **Reality** → **Decision** → **Resource** were primarily used to explain organizational decisions, demonstrate long-term project sustainability, and reinforce institutional reliability. Rather than addressing isolated criticism, these responses emphasized transparency in decision-making and strategic continuity.

A similar pattern was observed in public-sector communication, where responses were produced under conditions of heightened public scrutiny and political accountability. Here, response frames analogous to **Q-A-Angle** and **Anti-Justification** enabled institutions to articulate their position without adopting reactive or defensive communication strategies. Rather than responding to individual accusations, these responses focused on preserving institutional legitimacy and maintaining coherent public interpretation.

These observations suggest that the proposed model functions as a transferable system for meaning-making rather than a collection of sector-specific communication techniques. While the wording of responses inevitably varies across organizational settings, the underlying framing logic appears to remain stable. This finding indicates that response framing should be understood as a context-sensitive mechanism for shaping public interpretation through the strategic selection of communicative logics, rather than as a fixed repertoire of standardized responses.

Limitations and Directions for Further Research

The study is based on a single analytically examined case, which limits the possibility of statistical generalization. However, the purpose of the research is theoretical model construction rather than empirical generalization.

The identified response frames should therefore be understood as applicable across different communication contexts, while allowing for variation in their practical implementation depending on industry specifics and institutional conditions.

Further research may expand the empirical base and test the model across multiple organizational settings.



Conclusion

This article proposes an empirically grounded approach to analyzing public brand responses in the digital environment as a system of strategic framing rather than a collection of isolated reactions. Based on a single in-depth case analysis, the study demonstrates that reputational communication on social media can be described as a reproducible model of meaning-based response that functions independently of a formally recognized crisis event.

The principal outcome of the research is the development of an analytical model linking recurring forms of reputational tension to corresponding response-framing logics derived inductively from communication practice. Unlike classical crisis strategies, which are primarily organized around crisis type or organizational responsibility attribution, the proposed response frames operate through public interpretation management and enable the brand to maintain subjectivity under conditions of continuous public pressure.

The theoretical contribution of the study lies in expanding the understanding of crisis and strategic communication beyond reactive response logic. The authorial response frames illustrate the possibility of shifting from situational communication decisions toward a stable architecture of meaning that shapes audience expectations regarding the organization's principles, boundaries, and action logic.

The practical value of the study lies in demonstrating how these response frames can be used as strategic thinking tools for communication teams. Rather than serving as ready-made response templates, they function as analytical models that promote consistency of public reactions across different reputational contexts.

Overall, the findings confirm that systematic framing of public responses is a key contributor to reputational resilience in digital environments and represents a promising direction for further academic research in strategic communication.

Data Availability Statement. The analytical materials underlying this study are publicly available in the Zenodo repository at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18801927>. The repository contains anonymized analytical tables corresponding to Tables 1–3 presented in the article.

Ethics Approval. Ethical approval was not required for this study, as the research was based on publicly available anonymized data and did not involve human subjects or personal identifiable information.

Informed Consent. Not covered by the study.

Consent for Publication. Not covered by the study.

Declaration of generative artificial intelligence and technologies using artificial intelligence in the writing process. Author confirms that no artificial intelligence tools were used to create, write, or edit the text during the preparation of this manuscript. All results are original and obtained without the help of AI. During the preparation of the scientific article, artificial intelligence tools were used solely as an auxiliary means for linguistic editing and stylistic refinement of the English-language text. Artificial intelligence was not used for the development of the research hypothesis, the construction of the theoretical model, the collection, selection, or analysis of empirical material, the interpretation of research findings, or the formulation of scientific conclusions. All conceptual provisions, analytical categories, frames, conclusions, and scholarly interpretations are the result of the author's independent academic work and are grounded in the author's professional expertise, theoretical analysis, and inductive research approach. The author assumes full responsibility for the content of the article and for adherence to the principles of academic integrity.



Permissions. Not covered by the study.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks senior communication professionals for their practical insights that informed the empirical material of this study, as well as colleagues for their analytical feedback during manuscript preparation.

References

- Abboodi, B., Pileggi, S., Bharathy, G. (2023). Social networks in crisis management: A literature review. *Social Networks and Crisis Management*, 3(3), 84. <https://www.mdpi.com/2673-8392/3/3/84>
- Abiodun, G., & Nwabueze, E. A. (2025). *Social media as a tool for crisis communication: A review of strategies and case studies* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 5219257). Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5219257>
- Başaran, D. (2024). Exploring the impact of social media crisis management on customer trust and corporate reputation: The case of Starbucks Türkiye. *Research Journal of Business and Management*, 11(2), 94-111. <https://doi.org/10.17261/Pressacademia.2024.1949>
- Bielecka, H., Feifei, H., Strzelecki, A. (2025). Antecedents and management strategies of social media crises and their efficacy. *European Journal of Management & Business Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-08-2024-0271>
- Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (Eds.). (2022). *The handbook of crisis communication* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2020). *Corporate communication: A guide to theory and practice* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Eriksson, M., & Olsson, E. K. (2016). Facebook and Twitter in crisis communication: A comparative study of professionals and citizens. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 24(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12116>
- Genovino, F. (2025). Exploring corporate reputation and crisis communication dynamics. *Journal of Corporate Reputation and Crisis Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-024-00353-8>
- Heide, M., & Simonsson, C. (2021). What was that all about? On internal crisis communication and communicative coworkership during a pandemic. *Journal of Communication Management*, 25(3), 256-275. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-09-2020-0105>
- Jin, Y., Liu, B. F., & Austin, L. L. (Eds.). (2012). *Social media and crisis communication*. Routledge
- Larissu, Z., & Zulham. (2024). Crisis communication on social media: Managing reputation and maintaining public trust. *Journal of Dialogos*, 1(4). <https://doi.org/10.62872/dp3kv868>
- van der Meer, T. G. L. A., & Jin, Y. (2020). Seeking Formula for Misinformation Treatment in Public Health Crises: The Effects of Corrective Information Type and Source. *Health Communication*, 35(5), 560–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2019.1573295>
- Zhaldak, H. P., & Kozii, U. M. (2024). The role of social media in crisis communication in the modern business context. *Ekonomika, Menedzhment i Marketynh*, 11, 417-424. <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2024-11-417-424>

Received 27.02.2026
Approved 20.07.2026
Published 22.09.2026