

Crisis Communication in the Face of Data Breaches

Jukka Ruohonen^{a,*}, Kalle Hjerppe^b, Katleena Kortesus^c

^aUniversity of Southern Denmark, DK-6400 Sønderborg, Denmark

^bUniversity of Turku, 20014 Turun yliopisto, Finland

^cUniversity of Jyväskylä, PL 35, 40014 Jyväskylän yliopisto, Finland

Abstract

Data breaches refer to unauthorized accesses to data. Typically but not always, data breaches are about cyber crime. An organization facing such a crime is often also in a crisis situation. Therefore, organizations should prepare also for data breaches in their crisis management procedures. These procedures should include also crisis communication plans. To this end, this paper examines data breach crisis communication strategies and their practical executions. The background comes from the vibrant crisis communication research domain. According to a few qualitative case studies from Finland, the conventional wisdom holds well; the successful cases indicate communicating early, taking responsibility, offering an apology, and notifying public authorities. The unsuccessful cases show varying degrees of the reverse, including shifting of blame, positioning of an organization as a victim, and failing to notify public authorities. With these qualitative insights, the paper contributes to the research domain by focusing specifically on data breach crises, their peculiarities, and their management, including with respect to European regulations that have been neglected in existing crisis communication research.

Keywords: cyber security, crisis management, impression management, GDPR, SCCT

1. Introduction

A data breach can be defined simply as unauthorized access to data. The data involved may be personal data of natural persons, but it may also refer to valuable business data or sensitive and even classified data held by public sector organizations. Therefore, data breaches pose a significant reputation risk to organizations. Financial consequences are likely for companies. If a data breach has involved personal data, also these victims may be exposed to financial fraud in addition to psychological harm and even threats to personal safety. Data breaches also reduce trust throughout a society.

An organization may face different crises throughout its lifetime. What separates an organizational crisis from other unpleasant situations is the threat to an organization's valuable assets, the surprise element, meaning that the timing of a crisis is almost always unexpected or unanticipated, and the urgency and short response time (Bell, 2010;

*Corresponding author.

Email address: juk@mimi.sdu.dk (Jukka Ruohonen)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

June 5, 2024

[Ndlela, 2019](#)). Organizational crises are low-probability but high-impact events ([Syed, 2020](#)). Then, crisis management refers to the processes by which organizations deal with crises before, during, and after their occurrence ([Badu et al., 2023](#)). These characterizations apply also to data breach crises. Nowadays, data is a valuable asset for most organizations, and breaches of data thus threaten organizations' critical assets. Even under careful cyber security preparations, data breaches, like most successful cyber attacks, are also unexpected and extraordinary events to an organization. Like all organizational crises, data breaches further require urgent attention from an organization.

Before a crisis, to prevent data breaches from occurring to begin with, organizations should invest in cyber security. It is impossible to provide universal guidelines on which areas the investments should specifically focus, but typical examples include sound engineering practices, testing and hardening, patching procedures for known vulnerabilities, documentation including an incident response plan, auxiliary technical solutions such as intrusion detection systems, training for employees and security awareness campaigns, and even so-called bug bounties and red team exercises. However, not all data breaches occur due to technical exploitation of vulnerabilities in systems; also so-called inside jobs and lost or stolen computer equipment have been relatively frequent causes for data breaches ([Lanois, 2019](#); [Ruohonen et al., 2024](#)). Therefore, the investments should target also organizational security. In any case, an organization faces many tasks also during and after a data breach crisis. While it is again impossible to list all potential tasks, the typical examples include damage examination and minimization of further damage, setting up a team of expert investigators, informing those affected, in-house legal counseling, and contacting of an insurance company, among other things ([Teichmann and Boticiu, 2024](#)). The informing obligation falls to the domain of crisis communication, which too is a central element in crisis management. Ideally, an organization should also have a crisis communication strategy before a data breach crisis occurs.

In fact, crisis communication is not an optional procedure; it is a necessity. If an organization's goal is to comply with the information security standard ISO/IEC 27000, it must also plan crisis communication. The standard requires, among other things, that information security instructions are available to all employees and that possible deviations can be reported quickly within an organization ([Diamantopoulou et al., 2020](#); [Kamil et al., 2023](#)). In practice, this requirement is preventive crisis communication; clear information security instructions and open reporting of deviations help to prevent crises and reduce their impact. In addition, the standard requires a crisis communication plan for data breaches and data leaks. A complying organization must also have ready-made communication models, roles, and structures because in case of a disruption it must be able to communicate with public authorities, customers, stakeholders, and media ([Diamantopoulou et al., 2020](#)). Regulations add further requirements.

While there are some existing studies on crisis communication in data breach crisis situations, the amount of this literature is very modest when compared to the more general crisis communication research literature. Therefore, more contributions to this underresearched domain are always welcome. The literature contains some notable limitations. Among these is a lack of research that would have connected data breach crisis communication to existing regulations. To this end, this paper discusses data breach crises and their communication in a European context. The two European regulations considered are the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the so-called NIS2 directive, that is, Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and Directive (EU) 2022/2555, respectively. The for-

mer became enforceable in 2018, while the latter should be transposed by the member states by October 2024. While both laws impose requirements for incident response, among other things, particularly the GDPR is important in the present context because it contains many legal requirements for handling personal data breaches, including legal liability from careless or negligent information security practices.

These regulations and their relation to crisis communication are discussed in the opening Section 2. The section also serves as a theoretical overview and a literature review. The overall goal is to better connect the limited and specific data breach literature to the domains of strategic communication and public relations. A further notable limitation in the existing crisis communication research literature is that it has mostly concentrated on private sector companies (Horsley and Barker, 2002). However, data breaches can occur to any type of an organization, including public sector and non-governmental organizations. To patch this limitation, the subsequent Section 3 presents a few qualitative case studies that contain also public sector data breaches. The goal is to examine the crisis communication strategies employed by the organizations affected by data breaches; these strategies range from apologies to shifting of blame, offering compensations, and communicating early. All cases are from Finland. This geographic attention is welcome because most of the existing research on data breaches has concentrated on large breaches particularly in the United States. In addition to the public sector criterion, the case selection was done so that both good and bad, or successful and unsuccessful, cases are present. The empirical material in all cases is based on news articles in media and official statements from public authorities. Finally, Section 4 provides a concluding discussion, an elaboration of limitations, and some ideas for further research.

2. Crisis Communication and Data Breaches

2.1. Images, Situations, and Strategies

The two presumably most influential theories in crisis communication are the image repair theory and the situational crisis communication theory (SCCT). The first is based on the assumption that crisis communication is primarily about reducing reputation damage. This goal-oriented theory comes with different communication strategies for repairing an image, including defensive utterances, such as justifications, denials, excuses, and apologies, and other rhetorical and persuasive tactics (Benoit, 2015). By the means of communication and impression management, an organization affected by a crisis should thus seek to quickly reestablish the image, reputation, and legitimacy of the organization (Bell, 2010). Such reestablishment is often easier when an organization already has a good reputation (Nöhammer et al., 2023). Therefore, impression management should apply throughout an organization's lifetime. Once a crisis is over, it is possible to foster the image restoration process by renewal discourse, emphasizing the challenges, opportunities, and lessons learned (Liu et al., 2020). The situational theory variant is based on the same rationale of image preservation or restoration. Also it comes with different crisis communication strategies, but with an addition of guidelines on how to match the strategies to different types of crises and their situational characteristics, including how much an organization is responsible, the organization's ability to handle a given crisis, and the severity of the crisis (Coombs and Holladay, 2002). The situational characteristics are important because these underline that an organization

may be guilty of wrongdoing, but organizations often face also different crises that are beyond their control, whether these are natural disasters, destructive fires, major labor union strikes, terror attacks, or other *force majeure* events. Obviously, therefore, also the communication strategies should differ.

According to existing results, having a strategy is beneficial to an organization; it helps to maintain customer support during and after a crisis (Racer and Johnson, 2001). However, the evidence is generally mixed regarding the universal appropriateness of some particular crisis communication strategies. If an organization is responsible for a crisis, some authors maintain that a decent strategy involves apologizing, accepting responsibility, and showing remorse (Claeys and Opgenhaffen, 2016; Horsley and Barker, 2002). This strategy can be accompanied with other related strategies, such as bolstering of positive information to the crisis situation and redress even in the form of monetary compensations (Coombs, 2015). Denial and attempts to shift blame to others can quickly backfire like many of the other more offensive strategies, such as deceptive spins, downplaying, or attacking the accuser. In fact, backfiring is guaranteed in case an organization is later found to bear responsibility for a given crisis. However, denial can still work in low-risk and low-responsibility situations, including the cases in which an organization already has a bad reputation, and apologies are culturally dependent; not all apologies are the same and these may be perceived as insincere in some settings, and there may even be legal repercussions from outright accepting liability (Coombs and Holladay, 2002; Park and Choi, 2023; Nöhammer et al., 2023). Denial is also an appropriate strategy in so-called non-crisis situations; sometimes it may be that an incident is merely a rumor spread by some malicious parties and people on social media. Although litigation is slow and faces many challenges in the data breach context (Mills, 2017), for better or worse, fear of litigation has still been a typical reason to limit data breach crisis communication (Thomas et al., 2022). These considerations justify the SCCT; there is no single strategy that would work in all cases.

Both theories are relevant also for data breaches, which usually involve a high risk of reputation damage to organizations. Data is the new oil, so the saying goes, and thus losing valuable data to criminals is hardly good business to say the least. Data breaches also demonstrate how a company's reputation may have direct financial consequences. A data breach may well decrease consumers' purchasing intentions. A grave data breach may even affect the stock price of a company (Johnson et al., 2017), and a large espionage scandal may affect a whole country's image, and so forth.

Regarding communication strategies, it seems sensible to recommend that organizations should stick to facts and truth-telling as closely as possible. For reasons soon to be discussed, facts are likely to emerge sooner or later in any case. However, this strategy does not imply that all facts should be disclosed to the public. For instance, sensitive technical details should be left out already because these might expose an organization to further attacks and incidents (Thomas et al., 2022). Provided that a data breach is real and not merely a rumor, strategies such as denial and justification are likely bad choices at least in the European context. While denial is problematic because of the backfiring risk, justification is likely a poor choice because it will explicitly signal the poor cyber security posture of an organization. These points do not mean that the conventional wisdom should be abandoned altogether. Indeed, apologies and admission of responsibility are expected after a data breach, and compensations may further reduce the reputation damage (Jenkins et al., 2014; Knight and Nurse, 2020; Kuipers and Schonheit,

2022; Masuch et al., 2021). Regarding the facts to be disclosed, at least the number of people affected should be delivered (Chatterjee et al., 2019). It is further important to disclose the type of personal data that has been breached. Such disclosure is often necessary for the people affected to protect themselves. Without knowing whether social security numbers have been breached, for instance, it is impossible to prepare for a threat of identity thefts. Analogous point applies to financial identifiers such as credit card details.

In contrast, softer strategies such as storytelling (Lee and Jahng, 2020) and other narrative approaches may have a limited applicability in the data breach context. Moreover, the more there are facts, the less room there is for narratives and stories (Clementson, 2020). Rather analogous points apply with respect to dealing the public’s emotional response. Data breaches are oftentimes emotionally intensive for the people affected; these often arouse strong negative feelings, such as anxiety, fear, disgust, sadness, and anger (Bachura et al., 2017; Chatterjee et al., 2019; Syed, 2020). Strong negative emotions are also likely to increase the probability of negative word-of-mouth after a crisis (Coombes, 2015). Existing results further indicate that particularly spinning stories anger people further, while giving answers without embellishment lessens the public’s anger toward an organization (Clementson and Xie, 2020). Such results bespeak for the plain truth-telling as a strategy.

If narrative approaches are still used, a possible strategy involves trying to frame the organization affected by a data breach as a victim too, possibly further offering mitigative instructions for the people affected in order to lessen their anger, disgust, and other negative emotions (Syed, 2020). The mitigative instructions may involve security training material, but an organization affected by a data breach might offer also free protective services, such as credit monitoring or fraud protection solutions (Borgesius et al., 2023; Chatterjee et al., 2019). While some authors have been critical about this strategy, arguing against “playing the victim card” (Knight and Nurse, 2020; Kuipers and Schonheit, 2022), the strategy is sincere in the sense that many organizations affected by data breaches truly are victims of computer crimes. At the same time, many of these victim organizations have also suffered from poor defensive cyber security or even plain negligence thereto, which may well decrease the strategy’s effectiveness compared to the conventional strategy of admitting responsibility, offering apology, and providing redress or mitigations. Because the strategy typically leads to two victim types, the organization and the persons affected, it may also complicate or even prevent other mitigative strategies, such as offering sympathy to the persons affected, which has been observed to lessen negative emotions (Xu and Wu, 2020). A similar maneuver does not work well with organizations because it is difficult to feel sympathy or empathy toward an abstract entity such as an organization (Schoofs et al., 2022). The duality may cause also other problems. For instance: if an organization positions itself alone as a victim, the other victims, the persons affected may show progressive disappointment and anger toward the organization. These points again underline that while the literature offers some practical recommendations and best practices, there is no single way to communicate in a data breach crisis.

2.2. Informing People and Stakeholders

The IRT and SCCT may sound a little cynical, as both are primarily about protecting an organization and its image with communication strategies, some of which may

even be seen as borderline unethical. Therefore, it should be emphasized that crisis communication involves also informing the victims of a crisis. In fact, it can be argued that the foremost task in reliable crisis communication is to inform the public about an incident and the ways people affected may protect themselves (Lee and Jahng, 2020). The public should know what is happening, who is affected, and what countermeasures the people affected may take. This requirement is particularly important in serious, life-threatening crises, such as natural or man-made environmental catastrophes and public health emergencies. That said, the requirement applies also to data breach crises. As already said, immediately informing the people affected is important in order for them to prepare themselves for countering identity thefts and other harms; these victims do not have the time to wait for the legal system and regulators to give them adequate relief (Mills, 2017). To this end, some have recommended a dialogue approach with the public, arguing against a prevailing myth that the public will panic or behave inappropriately due to the information delivered (Chatterjee et al., 2019; Seeger, 2006). Rather, panic tends to occur when a crisis is suddenly communicated by third-parties such as the media (Badu et al., 2023). To be effective, such a dialogue approach requires that an organization already knows where the public stands; therefore, media monitoring, public opinion surveys, and related techniques should be preferably applied prior to a crisis.

Similar points apply with respect to informing an organization's important stakeholders, whether they are employees, financiers, suppliers, interest groups, or governmental actors. In fact, it can be argued that stakeholders should be informed prior to informing the public, as stakeholders are vital to an organization's operating environment. A failure to inform stakeholders may cause long-lasting trust issues to an organization.

Also the communication strategies may differ between the public and stakeholders. If there is confidence in the stakeholders, such that no information leaks can be assumed to occur, it is often recommended to stick as close to the truth as possible, providing information that is reliable, consistent, and credible (Ndlela, 2019). The information delivered may include also soft guidelines on how a stakeholder should behave and what is expected from the stakeholder in the crisis situation (Marynissen and Lauder, 2020). Because coordination can be defined as a process of managing dependencies between activities (Malone and Crowston, 1994; Ruohonen et al., 2018), such guidelines may reduce a risk that coordination fails because stakeholders do not understand their actions and the impact of these actions to other stakeholders and the crisis itself (Badu et al., 2023). Regarding communication, it can indeed be detrimental to an organization's image if stakeholders communicate on their own with diverging messages. Particularly public disagreements should be avoided (Knight and Nurse, 2020). The more there is convergence in the messages, the more neutral and credible the sender (Luoma-aho et al., 2017). Actually, through inter-organizational cooperation, it is possible to strengthen a message delivered to the public by combining the voices from multiple stakeholders (Liu et al., 2020). Again, an obvious prerequisite is that an organization knows all its relevant stakeholders; techniques such as stakeholder mapping can be used for this task. Also trust-building should apply among stakeholders prior to a crisis because cooperation and coordination are known to work poorly in the absence of trust (Badu et al., 2023). The importance of stakeholders is further reinforced by regulations.

If a data breach has involved personal data, like most data breaches likely have, the organizations who process personal data on behalf of an organization who possesses the data should notify the controller according to the GDPR's Article 33. In other words, a

data breach affecting a processing stakeholder should be communicated to the parent organization who holds the personal data. This mandate is important because it should in theory ensure that important information traverses in supply-chain cyber attacks involving personal data. Such attacks have recently gained prominence (Martínez and Durán, 2021; Yeboah-Ofori and Islam, 2019). Although the GDPR does not consider the reverse relation, also it should be taken into account already due to maintaining trust between business associates or other important stakeholders who deal with personal data. If there are multiple possessors, the responsibilities and compliance should be negotiated in advance according to Article 26 in the regulation. These regulatory mandates again signify the importance of prior planning. Ideally, this planning should include also joint crisis communication plans among the various possible processors and possessors. Without plans, it is possible that so-called crisis spillover will occur, meaning that also a victim organization’s stakeholders and partners will suffer from reputation damage or other negative consequences (Voges et al., 2024). Furthermore, the information exchanges are not limited to traditional stakeholders and business partners. Also regulators and governmental bodies should be typically notified after a data breach.

2.3. Notifying Public Authorities

Today, in Europe, regulators and governmental actors are particularly relevant. If a data breach has involved personal data, a national data protection authority (DPA) should be informed. According to Article 33 in the GDPR, omission of the notification is possible only in case a breach “is unlikely to result in a risk to the rights and freedoms of natural persons”. Personal data, as defined in the GDPR’s Article 4, refers to “any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person”. The scope is thus much wider than the personally identifiable information (PII) concept used in the United States. While a risk assessment is left to an organization affected by a personal data breach, most breaches therefore should involve a notification to a DPA. Without undue delay, according to Article 34 in the GDPR, a high-risk personal data breach should be further communicated to the persons affected either directly or through mass communication. According to the same article, a DPA may also force an organization to comply with this informing obligation toward the people affected by a personal data breach. To determine a high-risk scenario, an organization might deduce whether a breach has involved special categories of personal data (Borgesius et al., 2023), as defined in the GDPR’s Article 9. Though, arguably also leakage of conventional personal identifiers, such as social security numbers, satisfy a high-risk scenario for the persons affected. In addition, the GDPR imposes many other requirements, including documentation about personal data processing, its legal basis, and technical and organizational security measures to protect the data and its processing. The documentation should be in place even in case an organization determines that a breach does not pose a high risk to the natural persons affected. According to Article 33, detailed documentation should be available to a DPA also with respect to already occurred personal data breaches.

Furthermore, the NIS2 directive has laid down notification obligations for so-called essential and important entities. These entities include not only traditional critical infrastructure providers, such as those operating in the energy and transport sectors, but also the banking, finance, healthcare, water, and food sectors are covered together with public administration units and some of the Internet’s core infrastructure elements. The notifications required should be delivered to national computer security incident response

teams (CSIRTs), which are distinct from DPAs in most member states. However, according to Article 23 in the NIS2 directive, only significant incidents should be reported; these include those incidents that cause severe operational disruption or those that have affected or are capable of affecting “other natural or legal persons by causing considerable material or non-material damage”. Thus, also severe data breaches are covered, including large-scale personal data breaches and serious breaches involving non-personal data. If a data breach has involved a computer crime, such as an intrusion to systems or networks, like most data breaches have, a criminal report should be further made to a national law enforcement unit.

After having potentially contacted one or more of these three public authority types, the communication is not any more entirely in the hands of an organization itself. While confidentiality should be guaranteed with the public authorities, it is clear that some of the crisis communication strategies, such as outright denial, are no longer applicable after this point. Thereafter, the diversity of voices in media may increase as public authorities may also appear in media, providing expertise and their own interpretations of a given data breach crisis, which often focus (or should focus) on those affected because public authorities first and foremost represent the public interests (Raupp, 2019). To decrease the diversity, which may have negative consequences for an organization’s image, it may be possible in some serious cases to continue crisis communication jointly with the public authorities involved. Another related option is to align an organization’s data breach crisis communication to the voice from public authorities.

It has been suspected that some of the somewhat shady communication tactics, such as controverting and delaying of communication, have decreased after the GDPR was enacted (Shastri et al., 2021). As a data breach crisis unfolds, it is indeed often recommended to remain open and transparent with both regulators and the public (Lanois, 2019). Both the GDPR and the NIS2 directive entail also potentially large administrative fines from non-compliance or other misbehavior, which should further increase the incentive for remaining transparent and trustworthy. Indeed, cyber security incidents, including data breaches, have been a frequent reason for GDPR enforcement fines, some of which have been levied also due to a failure to comply with the GDPR’s notification mandates (Ruohonen and Hjerppe, 2022). If a breach leads to a formal investigation by a DPA or other public authority, also the crisis communication strategy should likely further change. Under these settings, a strategy of acknowledging and waiting may work; an organization should acknowledge a data breach and communicate it to the persons affected, as also required by the GDPR in high-risk personal data breaches, but then wait for the results of an investigation before communicating further (Jong, 2020). To some extent, this strategy aligns with a “no comment” strategy often advised by legal counsel (Horsley and Barker, 2002). These strategies may even be a necessity in some cases. For instance, a law enforcement unit may forbid a disclosure of any sensitive details during a criminal investigation of a data breach.

2.4. Timing of Communication

Timing of crisis communication is important. During the start of a crisis, there is usually a very high demand for information from the press and the people affected by the crisis. Therefore, it is usually maintained that delaying communication is a bad idea; waiting to address audiences and the media at a later time when more information is available can be detrimental to an organization’s image (Horsley and Barker, 2002). The

reason is clear: a lack of communication often leads to rumors and speculations about the organization in question, perhaps suggesting that it may have something more to hide or that it simply does not care. Such rumors and speculations nowadays spread fast and wide due to social media. Thus, traditional framing and perception shaping strategies may work poorly in the modern digital era in which multiple online media and so-called social media influencers may produce their own crisis narratives. Influencers may also significantly contribute to the public’s emotional response (Mak and Ao, 2019). Therefore, analogously to the earlier points about stakeholders and public authorities, an organization should communicate early in order to root a desired crisis narrative. As said, early communication is also necessary for the persons affected to protect themselves.

Rapid response is behind the common idiom of “stealing the thunder”, meaning generally that organizations should self-disclose incriminating information instead of trying to conceal it. Such self-disclosure may affect positively the image of an organization facing a crisis because the organization may be perceived as being honest, credible, and capable of handling the crisis (Lee, 2020). In reverse, inactivity and passivity tend to be associated with ineffectiveness and a lack of trust (Luoma-aho et al., 2017). The actual response strategy involves two steps: the self-disclosure or “stealing” should occur before the media and public discover a crisis, and, then, “thunder” occurs when an organization waits for and responds to inquiries from the media, stakeholders, and public (Claeys and Opgenhaffen, 2016). It is possible to incorporate other strategies, such as apologies, to the response phase. This strategy presumably works better when an organization has already built a relationship with media beforehand. Regardless, once the thunder has arrived, it is important for an organization’s spokespersons to remain accessible to media; there should be no information vacuums (Ndlela, 2019). Then, during communication with media, it is often advised to avoid inconsistency by accepting uncertainty and avoiding offers of overly reassuring messages (Seeger, 2006). This strategy may work also in the data breach context.

In particular, as could be expected, proactive self-disclosure has helped organizations affected by data breaches to control the narratives in media, whereas communication delays have often caused harsh criticism in media (Kuipers and Schonheit, 2022). Of course, the stealing of the thunder strategy requires that an organization is the first entity to become aware of a data breach and to communicate it to the media and public. This prerequisite can be challenging in the data breach context because data breaches are difficult to detect within an organization; typically, it can take months before a data breach is detected (Ruohonen et al., 2024). Therefore, at least the criminals involved already possess the data stolen and the associated critical information. If the criminals have not made the data and information public, on the other hand, the incentive for stealing the thunder should increase. Because a relatively large amount of data breaches is detected by third-parties instead of the organizations affected (Weir et al., 2017), the incentive should intensify since information about a data breach may already be located outside of an organization. Even when the third-parties involved are not malicious, a leakage of the sensitive information about the existence of a data breach may occur.

Also regulations impose strict requirements for the timing of communication. According to the GDPR’s Article 33, a data breach involving personal data should be communicated to a DPA no later than 72 hours after having become aware of it. Furthermore, according to Article 23 in the NIS2 directive, essential and important entities should forward an early warning about a significant incident to a CSIRT within 24 hours

of becoming aware of such an incident, and this notification should be accompanied by a more comprehensive incident notification within 72 hours. Thereafter, a CSIRT may request status updates at any time. Furthermore, within a month, a final report of the significant incident should be delivered. Thus, in Europe the urgency in data breach crises situations is intensified by regulations. The very strict deadlines and short response times, which have been also criticized ([Borgesius et al., 2023](#); [Weir et al., 2017](#)), yet again signify the importance of having crisis communication and incident response plans in advance. Although the GDPR does not specify a strict deadline for informing the people affected by a high-risk personal data breach, it seems sensible to recommend that stealing the thunder, if not already done, should occur fairly quickly after a notification has been delivered to a DPA. The same point applies with respect to the significant incidents specified in the NIS2 directive. All in all, also timing should belong to a data breach crisis communication plan.

3. Case Studies

3.1. *The Vastaamo Breach*

The Vastaamo data breach shocked Finland in 2020. It involved a breach of a psychotherapy center whose sensitive data was leaked to the darknet and further used in personalized extortion. Given the sensitivity of the personal data involved, the breach was immensely traumatic for the persons affected; according to media, it has been suspected that even suicides were committed due to the breach. Therefore, it is no wonder that the breach has been a constant topic in local news for the past four years. It has also gathered international media attention. Early on during the crisis, when there was limited information available, some speculated that the breach might have even been conducted by a state actor in order to test the country's resilience. Later on, law enforcement found the perpetrator to be a Finnish person with an already existing cyber crime record from his teenage years. He was sentenced in 2024 to over six years in prison due to the breach, extortion, and unauthorized release of private information. The breach was the largest crime in Finland's history in terms of the number of victims. The actual technical details that allowed the breach were simple; the company's database was open to the Internet without a firewall and it was protected by weak or even default passwords.

In the midst of the crisis, communication failed miserably; there were widespread panic, speculations to all directions, and wild rumors. It was only later on when public authorities, including law enforcement and the national DPA, got involved that the crisis communication started to gain coherence and reliability. There was no stealing of the thunder; it was only after the perpetrator appeared in the darknet with the stolen data that the company was forced to answer to inquiries from the media and public. Yet, there were plenty of opportunities for self-disclosure. As the crisis unfolded, it became clear that the company's management knew about the blatant cyber security negligence. In fact, earlier breaches had occurred, but these had been brushed under the carpet by the management. During the inquiries, the company's chief executive officer (CEO) also contributed to the speculations and rumors by stating that the breach might be an inside job. In addition, he and his business associates sold their shares of the company in an attempt to salvage financial losses. These attempts backfired. The company went bankrupt and the CEO was later sentenced to a probation for a data protection crime.

It was only after the conviction that the CEO finally apologized for the victims about the serious and foul incident. Regarding the GDPR, the company was fined a little over 600 thousand euros due to gross negligence of the regulation's various articles, including Article 25 on the data protection by design and default, Article 32 on the security of personal data processing, and the noted Articles 33 and 34 on the obligations to inform a DPA and the persons affected. In terms of crisis communication, it is further worth emphasizing that the company did not really show remorse, accept responsibility, or offer solid advice on how the victims should prepare for identity thefts and other consequences from the gross violation of their privacy. Instead, the state was forced to organize crisis support, including emotional and psychological help. Also volunteers contributed to this helping effort, including during the law enforcement investigation and later on when monetary compensations were pursued by the victims. All in all, the Vastaamo breach is a showcase of almost all things that can go wrong in a crisis management of a data breach.

3.2. The Helsinki City Breach

In the early summer of 2024, it was reported that the city of Helsinki in Finland had suffered a data breach. At the time of writing, the crisis is still ongoing, but some lessons are still possible to draw from the breach. The breach involved a compromise of the city's educational data. As is typical in data breaches, the amount of persons affected increased step by step. According to recent estimates, about 150,000 records were breached, including personal data of past and present school pupils, their parents, and the city's employees. According to media, the technical details that allowed the breach showed gross negligence of cyber security; a vulnerability was unpatched for almost two years in a server, although a patch was available from a vendor. By exploiting the vulnerability, an attacker was able to breach a network drive that contained over ten million documents. These documents contained personal identifiers, including social security numbers, but also sensitive details of the victims were present, including health records and details about special educational needs of children. The unstructured storing of such a huge amount of documents to a network drive further displays negligence of sound architectural and infrastructural practices in information technology deployments.

The city's crisis communication strategy seemed to rely on positioning of the city as a victim of a cyber crime. During an interview, the city's mayor made this positioning explicit, but he neither apologized nor showed notable remorse. Thus, it is no wonder that the public response has been highly critical. According to a journalistic survey conducted by media, the parents affected indeed exhibited deep anger toward the city, which, according to their viewpoint, neither took responsibility nor provided clear advice on mitigations. Also the city's crisis communication was widely criticized. No one has apologized or offered empathy to the other, "truer" victims, the parents, children, and employees affected by the data breach. Analogously to the Vastaamo breach, the mitigation instructions were further largely outsourced to third-parties, including the media in particular. On paper, everything went fine with public authorities; law enforcement and the national DPA were notified as required. As inconvenient facts started to appear in media, however, further data protection negligence started to gain traction in public discourse. For instance, the city was forced to admit that it had violated the GDPR's mandate for fixed data retention times. Due to the network drive's configuration, the city was also unable to determine whose personal data was specifically stolen; hence, the city was unable to fulfill the GDPR's requirement of preferably individualized notifications

to the persons affected. In addition, the likely wrong choice of trying to play the victim card was supposedly made worse by the fact that the city already had a bad reputation in information technology, given an earlier crisis involving a severe dysfunction of the city's payment system for its employees' salaries. Given this history and the public sector context, it is understandable that the public discourse quickly further escalated into politics. Among other things, political accountability was asked for and the national DPA was forced to regret the Finland's odd decision to exclude public sector organizations from the scope of the GDPR's administrative fines.

3.3. The Kuopio City Accident

In 2022 the city of Kuopio in Finland faced an accident in which personal data of the city's employees was leaked through email. The data included salary information, social security numbers, and information about belongings to labor unions, among other things. The accident was simple; the city's human resource department by mistake sent an Excel file containing the personal data to the city's internal email list. After the incident, the city promptly notified the national DPA, apologized for the employees, and, to some extent, offered also sympathy to them. After fierce but constructive criticism from the employees affected, the city further acknowledged that some of the data was likely collected unnecessarily. The case is notable because it demonstrates that data breaches can happen also by accident; not all breaches are about cyber crime.

3.4. The Matriculation Examination Board Accident

In 2018 it was reported in media that the Matriculation Examination Board, a public sector organization that is responsible for granting high school diplomas, accidentally put a system online that exposed personal data of about six thousand young students. Once again, social security numbers were among the data exposed. During an investigation conducted by the Board itself, the reason behind the exposure was a subcontractor who had put a so-called staging server online with the personal data exposed openly to the Internet. The case is worthy of notice because it shows that poor software engineering practices can also lead to data breaches; staging environments should not operate with pristine personal data to begin with (Hjerppe et al., 2019). Fortunately, the investigation also revealed that no one had accessed the data. While also notifying the media through a self-disclosure, the Board handled the communication with the students stylishly; each student was notified with a personal letter delivered through conventional mail.

3.5. The Prime Minister's Office Leak

In 2015 sensitive email exchanges between a prime minister and several high-profile civil servants were leaked from the the Prime Minister's Office. The unencrypted email exchanges were about sanctions against Russia. The perpetrator had offered the emails to media, and one magazine later on also published these. During the incident response, the Office started an internal examination and further notified the Finnish Security and Intelligence Service. A former prime minister also commented the leak in media. During the investigation, it became clear that the leak was not due to technical exploitation. Otherwise, however, the investigation ended without a result. The perpetrator was never caught. Although details were never published in media or released as official statements, it seems likely that the leak was an inside job within the Office. The motives behind

the leak were likely political. Therefore, this small-scale leak is worth noting because it highlights that data breaches can occur also due to lapses in organizational security. Furthermore, the leak has not been the only one affecting the Finnish central government in recent years. For instance, in 2019 classified documents were leaked to media from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland. Also this leak was related to a politically hot topic, the Finnish family members of jihadi fighters in the Al-Hawl refugee camp.

3.6. The Traficom Breach

In mid-2024 another public sector breach was reported in Finland. Although the details are not yet clear, the case is noteworthy because it involved a supply-chain cyber attack. Namely, personal data from the Finnish Transport and Communications Agency’s automobile register was leaked through a cyber attack to one of the register’s third-party data processors. The attacker was able to download about sixty thousand records through the attack. These included not only car details but also personal identifiers, such as home addresses and social security numbers of the car owners. The media has not reported how the breach was noticed, including whether the processor notified the Agency, as required by the GDPR. In terms of crisis communication, there has been a notable information vacuum in addition to a lack of apologies from any party involved. For instance, the Agency and other public authorities involved only encouraged the data processor to voluntarily come into the public sphere to answer to inquiries. Another point again relates to the mitigation instructions, which have not been delivered in the crisis communication. During an interview, a law enforcement officer investigating the breach correctly noted that data breaches unfortunately happen and therefore it is important to prepare for the consequences, but he offered no information sources on how the preparations should be specifically done. This lack of information is regrettable because many of the mitigations require adjusting privacy settings in information systems of public sector organizations.

3.7. The Forenom Breach

In 2020 a company that sells accommodation services was breached. The breach affected various types of personal data, such as contact details and credit ratings. The company communicated early through a self-disclosure, promptly took responsibility, duly notified the national DPA, and apologized for the natural persons affected by the breach. Despite this “by the book” communication strategy, the company ended to an investigation by the DPA due to complaints from several persons. During the investigation, it became clear that the breach was made possible by a conventional structured query language (SQL) injection in the company’s software stack. Although no fines were imposed, the DPA further found that the company had violated the GDPR’s data minimization principle in Article 5, the requirement for fixed data retention specified in the same article, and the requirement for appropriate technical measures to ensure information security, as specified in Article 32. The case is noteworthy because it demonstrates that communication alone does not prevent public authorities from taking action.

3.8. The STT Attack

In 2022 the Finnish News Agency (STT) got hit by a ransomware attack. Initially, also a data breach was suspected because the criminal group behind the attack claimed it had stolen all of the Agency’s data. In fact, a data breach might have been even worse

than a ransomware attack because of the sensitivity of the data involved, including data and data sources protected by journalistic confidentiality. Fortunately, the claim turned out to be false. The Agency also managed to stop the ransomware attack before its completion. Nor did the attack stop the round-the-clock news production. Furthermore, the Agency stole the thunder; a press release was immediately made already a day after the attack was detected. Thereafter, several further updates were released. Also incident response worked well; the Agency notified the national DPA and CSIRT, and further made a criminal report to a local law enforcement unit. As a testimony of good crisis management, the Agency later won a national information security award from its openness and effective stakeholder collaboration during the ransomware crisis.

4. Conclusion

4.1. Discussion

The qualitative cases presented exhibit an interesting mixture of different data breach crisis communication strategies. Although existing research has been critical about the applicability of the SCCT in the data breach context (Knight and Nurse, 2020), the theory’s basic premise holds well; there is no single universal communication strategy in data breach crises situations. As for the theory’s situational characteristics, particularly the question of how much an organization is responsible for a data breach is relevant. It may cause different interpretation problems during crisis management, especially given the urgency and short response times in data breach crises. Robustly determining the degree of responsibility is also necessary to comply with European regulations. According to the summary in Table 1, most of the cases presented satisfied the incident notification requirement toward public authorities. While all of the cases involved real incidents, it is also possible that organizations nowadays notify public authorities even in case an organization’s responsibility is not entirely clear at the time of the notifications. The strict deadlines in the GDPR and the NIS2 directive have likely contributed to such proactive notification practices. The notification practices notwithstanding, the cases exhibit a fairly large variation in crisis communication strategies and practices.

The cases considered include bad and ugly cases such as the Vastaamo breach in which partial denial, downplaying, shifting blame, failing to comply with regulations, and, in short, plain lying were all part of the crisis communication “strategy”. An attempt to position an organization as a victim was also present among the cases. As was expected from the literature review, this strategy was likely a bad choice compared to a plain admission of responsibility. It likely further angered the other victims, the people affected, among other things. The Helsinki city breach is also a good example otherwise because it demonstrates that organizational impression management should apply prior to a crisis. Also different information vacuums were present among the cases, suggesting that some of the organizations involved perhaps did not have crisis communication plans to begin with. Alternatively, there might have been internal issues within the organizations, such as opting for a wait and monitor strategy, fearing legal and regulatory implications, or a difficulty for the given crisis communicators to convince the management about a necessity to communicate early (cf. Claeys and Opgenhaffen, 2016). As the literature review indicated, fear of legal and regulatory implications, in particular, may lead to bad communication choices or even prevent efficient communication. That said,

Table 1: Summary of Case Study Results

	A ¹	B ²	C ³	D ⁴	E ⁵	F ⁶	G ⁷	H ⁸
Apology			✓	✓			✓	✓
Partial denial	✓							
Shifting blame	✓							
Offering sympathy			✓	✓				
Offering compensations								
Offering mitigation instructions								
Information vacuum	✓					✓		
Positioning as a victim		✓						
Stealing the thunder			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Notifying public authorities		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓

¹ The Vastaamo breach (Section 3.1)

² The Helsinki city breach (Section 3.2)

³ The Kuopio city accident (Section 3.3)

⁴ The Matriculation Examination Board accident (Section 3.4)

⁵ The Prime Minister's Office leak (Section 3.5)

⁶ The Traficom breach (Section 3.6)

⁷ The Forenom breach (Section 3.7)

⁸ The STT attack (Section 3.8)

it is unclear whether organizations in Europe might nowadays be able to escape a data breach crisis situation by avoiding communication altogether. As the Forenom breach pinpoints, furthermore, even a solid communication strategy may still cause regulatory action, although a good crisis communication plan is likely to also reduce the probability of administrative fines or even litigation. In this regard, the STT ransomware case is a good example on solid crisis management and communication. There is no justifiable reason to avoid stealing the thunder because of a fear of legal implications or regulations.

All in all, the successful cases tend to reinforce the conventional wisdom from the crisis communication research literature. While improvements are always possible, the organizations that indicated successful crisis communication generally took responsibility, stole the thunder, and promptly notified public authorities. The less successful or plainly unsuccessful organizations showed varying degrees of the reverse.

Some of the results may be perhaps partially explained by national characteristics. Although also contrary results have been presented (Luoma-aho et al., 2017), in some of the qualitative cases presented, the apparent difficulty or hesitance to offer an apology in a data breach crisis situation may be due to a Finnish organizational culture or, in the case of the public sector breaches, national political culture. The same point applies with respect to offering sympathy or empathy to the victims, which is mostly absent. Nor did the cases indicate offers of monetary or other compensations. Although monetary compensations were pursued through the justice system in the Vastaamo case, also the lack of voluntary compensation offers may generally relate to the Finnish culture. With the exception of this particular case, it should be further emphasized that the breaches, leaks, and accidents have been rather modest when compared to the large, globally relevant data breaches seen elsewhere. This point can be also interpreted to connote with a reasonably good cyber security posture of Finland generally.

There is also a further important point to make about Finland and data breaches.

Namely, the leakage of social security numbers is often a serious affair because these are still sometimes used incorrectly for authentication instead of merely uniquely identifying persons, as is the purpose of the numbers. The state recently changed the national data protection law to forbid authentication with social security numbers, but the practice likely still continues particularly in more informal settings such as phone calls to organizations. Therefore, also the risks of financial fraud and identity thefts are present in most of the cases considered. Even though the risks are mostly about petty crime, such as ordering things from online stores or taking quick loans with a stolen identity, these still cause a significant harm to the persons affected already because resolving the issues take a long time and requires activity from the persons themselves. In terms of communication, therefore, it might be a good idea for the state or other public sector organizations to improve their instructions for dealing with the risks. Paradoxically, as already remarked, many of the relevant remedies involve also adjusting settings in online systems of public sector organizations themselves. More fundamentally, therefore, it might be a good idea to also contemplate whether opt-in choices might be a better option than the opt-out choices nowadays typically used by default in the public sector context.

The results further indicate that public authorities have important auxiliary functions beyond criminal and compliance investigations. In line with previous results ([Marynisen and Lauder, 2020](#)), in case of grievous data breaches, such as the Vastaamo breach presented, public authorities and their communication also contribute to lessening of panic and maintaining overall trust in a society. To this end, also public authorities might consider evaluating or adjusting their data breach crisis communication strategies. Although blaming public authorities for slowness is a common political outcry ([Palttala et al., 2021](#)), timing of communication is still one thing to consider. In many of the cases presented, both the national DPA and law enforcement too were forced to enter the public sphere as media kept pushing a data breach narrative forward. Therefore, earlier and a more proactive communication might be beneficial to the society at large.

4.2. Limitations

Some limitations should be acknowledged. To begin with, generalizability should be acknowledged as a limitation. Although multiple case studies were conducted, these cannot be considered as a representative sample to describe data breach crisis communication generally in Finland, let alone in Europe as a whole. However, the basic premise from the SCCT applies also here; as no two crises are entirely similar, there is no one-size-fits-all crisis communication strategy, and, therefore, it is important to rather learn from good and bad examples ([Horsley and Barker, 2002](#)). Having said that, a further limitation is that the paper mostly shared the traditional organizational focus. This focus tends to dismiss the interconnectedness in crises, omitting or downplaying important social and institutional factors ([Fredriksson, 2014](#); [Raupp, 2019](#)). Although the institutional factors were to some extent accounted for with the focus on regulations and public authorities, highly severe data breach crises, such as the Vastaamo breach, often require a whole-of-society response. Therefore, further research should patch the limitation by considering a comprehensive societal viewpoint to large-scale data breach crises. Such a viewpoint requires also extending the scope of empirical material used. In this regard, a notable further limitation is that the case studies were based on news articles in traditional media and official statements from public authorities. Nowadays, however, particularly the public's response might be better gauged by data from social media. That said, neither

traditional media articles nor social media analytics can answer to a question why particular crisis actors did what they did. Thus, further surveys and interviews are required also in the data breach context. These should address also victims of data breaches and inter-organizational communication with stakeholders. The final limitation is that most of the cases considered were traditional personal data breaches. Thus, further insights are required on breaches involving non-personal data, given that also the crisis communication strategies may differ according to the type of data involved.

4.3. Further Work

The limitations briefly outlined furnish further research possibilities. Stakeholder coordination and communication are among these possibilities; further work is required to better understand how crisis communication occurs and how well it works when there are several intersecting stakeholders involved. Do they bear their responsibilities or perhaps blame each other? The work should also address crisis communication plans. Is a plan negotiated jointly between an organization and its stakeholders or do the latter operate on their own terms? Who bears the overall responsibility for communication? Rather similar points apply to internal communication within organizations. As was noted, it may well be that internal organizational problems were behind the crisis communication difficulties in some of the cases presented. Such problems could be perhaps addressed in further research by asking organizations for their crisis communication plans. This research approach would allow to also compare the intended crisis communication with the actual communication. Alternatively, it may be that organizations generally lack crisis communication plans; such a result would be noteworthy on its own right.

Another organizational research topic is closely related to the mentioned points about data breach crisis communication. According to the SCCT, in most cases organizations should readily accept responsibility when a situation requires to do so. However, only little is known about the practical aspects behind taking responsibility in the data breach context. Who specifically should take the responsibility? Should it be a CEO or perhaps an organization's information technology department and its staff? The questions are nontrivial because in some cases these extend beyond organizations' internal management. As the Helsinki city data breach demonstrates, in some cases responsibility may align with political accountability of elected or selected representatives. Also legal issues may be involved, including criminal liability, as the Vastaamo case again eagerly testifies.

The noted public sector mitigations would also offer a promising path for further research. Although plenty of research has been done to examine people's security awareness after data breaches, national and more specific surveys have been lacking. Particularly the various opt-out options present in various Finnish public sector organizations would need a closer examination. For instance, it may well be that the general public is for the most part unaware of the options, which is unfortunate already because the purpose of these is to protect citizens from various harms, whether in terms of privacy or financial matters. This presumption is reinforced by the case studies presented, none of which indicated offers of reasonable mitigation instructions to the victims. As awareness is closely related to communication, the topic does not diverge much from the issues discussed in this paper. Furthermore, more comparative research is needed to determine whether the available mitigations are similar across Europe. It may be that in some countries private sector options are more prevalent than public sector ones. More research is also needed

to evaluate how effective the mitigations are in practice. Data from law enforcement on identity thefts and related crimes would offer an ideal setup to examine this question.

Further research is also required to better understand the coping of persons affected by data breaches. Although there is some existing work (Gibson and Harfield, 2023), only little is generally known about how the victims of data breaches cope emotionally, psychologically, and otherwise. The Vastaamo case is again a good albeit dismal example. This research theme aligns with the noted whole-of-society crisis management approach because in many countries, including Finland, public sector organizations offer different emergency solutions for victims and other alarmed people, including chats and help through phone emergency services. In addition to the coping itself, it would be interesting to know how well the helping services have been communicated to the public.

Finally, also more technical research is needed. Although the GDPR in particular has stolen much of the attention in both research and practice, as was already noted, data breaches are present also in standards such as the ISO/IEC 27000 information security standard. Further evaluation work is required to determine how well the standard-imposed practices have been adopted and implemented in organizations. Moreover, further research is required to better understand the technical causes behind data breaches. Although technical details are often only partially disclosed, even limited information on the probable causes can be valuable for building preventive technical solutions and documenting best (and worst) information technology practices. Technical factors can be important also for organizational crisis communication. As the Helsinki city case demonstrates, technical factors and limitations can put crisis communicators into a difficult position or even prevent an effective response to a data breach.

References

- Bachura, E., Chen, R., Valecha, R., and Rao, H. R. (2017). Modeling Public Response to Data Breaches. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Americas Conference on Information Systems*, Boston. Available online in April, 2024: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/301372705.pdf>.
- Badu, J., Kruke, B. I., and Saetren, G. B. (2023). Crisis Communication and Trustworthiness Among Crisis Actors: Towards a Typology of Crisis Management Difficulties. *Safety in Extreme Environments*, 5:119–130.
- Bell, L. M. (2010). Crisis Communication: The Praxis of Response. *The Review of Communication*, 10(2):142–155.
- Benoit, W. L. (2015). *Accounts, Excuses, and Apologies: Image Repair Theory and Research*. State University of New York Press, Albany, second edition.
- Borgesius, F. Z., Asghari, H., Bangma, N., and Hoepman, J. (2023). The GDPR’s Rules on Data Breaches: Analysing Their Rationales and Effects. *SCRIPTed*, 20(2):352–382.
- Chatterjee, S., Gao, X., Sarkar, S., and Uzmanoglu, C. (2019). Reacting to the Scope of a Data Breach: The Differential Role of Fear and Anger. *Journal of Business Research*, 101:183–193.
- Claeys, A. and Opgenhaffen, M. (2016). Why Practitioners Do (not) Apply Crisis Communication Theory in Practice. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 28(5–6):232–247.
- Clementson, D. E. (2020). Narrative Persuasion, Identification, Attitudes, and Trustworthiness in Crisis Communication. *Public Relations Review*, 46:101889.
- Clementson, D. E. and Xie, T. (2020). Narrative Storytelling and Anger in Crisis Communication. *Communication Research Reports*, 37(4):212–221.
- Coombs, W. T. (2015). The Value of Communication During a Crisis: Insights from Strategic Communication Research. *Business Horizons*, 58:141–148.
- Coombs, W. T. and Holladay, S. J. (2002). Helping Crisis Managers Protect Reputational Assets: Initial Test of the Situational Crisis Communication Theory. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16(2):165–186.

- Diamantopoulou, V., Tsohou, A., and Karyda, M. (2020). From ISO/IEC27001:2013 and ISO/IEC27002:2013 to GDPR Compliance Controls. *Information and Computer Security*, 28(4):645–662.
- Fredriksson, M. (2014). Crisis Communication as Institutional Maintenance. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 3(3):319–340.
- Gibson, D. and Harfield, C. (2023). Amplifying Victim Vulnerability: Unanticipated Harm and Consequence in Data Breach Notification Policy. *International Review of Victimology*, 29(3):341–365.
- Hjerpe, K., Ruohonen, J., and Leppänen, V. (2019). The General Data Protection Regulation: Requirements, Architectures, and Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 27th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference (RE 2019)*, pages 265–275, Jeju Island. IEEE.
- Horsley, J. S. and Barker, R. T. (2002). Toward a Synthesis Model for Crisis Communication in the Public Sector. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 16(4):406–440.
- Jenkins, A., Anandarajan, M., and D’Ovidio, R. (2014). ‘All that Glitters is not Gold’: The Role of Impression Management in Data Breach Notification. *Western Journal of Communication*, 78(3):337–357.
- Johnson, M. S., Kang, M. J., and Lawson, T. (2017). Stock Price Reaction to Data Breaches. *Journal of Financial Issues*, 16(2):1–13.
- Jong, W. (2020). Anticipating the Unknown: Crisis Communication While Under Investigation. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 9(1):47–60.
- Kamil, Y., Lund, S., and Islam, M. S. (2023). Information Security Objectives and the Output Legitimacy of ISO/IEC 27001: Stakeholders’ Perspective on Expectations in Private Organizations in Sweden. *Information Systems and e-Business Management*, 21:699–722.
- Knight, R. and Nurse, J. R. C. (2020). A Framework for Effective Corporate Communication After Cyber Security Incidents. *Computers & Security*, 99:102036.
- Kuipers, S. and Schonheit, M. (2022). Data Breaches and Effective Crisis Communication: A Comparative Analysis of Corporate Reputational Crises. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 25:176–197.
- Lanois, P. (2019). How to Prepare for Data Breaches? Lessons Learned from Recent Incidents. *Journal of Data Protection & Privacy*, 2(3):213–223.
- Lee, H. and Jahng, M. R. (2020). The Role of Storytelling in Crisis Communication: A Test of Crisis Severity, Crisis Responsibility, and Organizational Trust. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 97(4):981–1002.
- Lee, S. Y. (2020). Stealing Thunder as a Crisis Communication Strategy in the Digital Age. *Business Horizons*, 63:801–810.
- Liu, B. F., Iles, I. A., and Herovic, E. (2020). Leadership under Fire: How Governments Manage Crisis Communication. *Communication Studies*, 71(1):128–147.
- Luoma-aho, V., Moreno, A., and Verhoeven, P. (2017). Crisis Response Strategies in Finland and Spain. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 25(4):223–231.
- Mak, A. K. and Ao, S. (2019). Revisiting Social-Mediated Crisis Communication Model: The Lancôme Regenerative Crisis after the Hong Kong Umbrella Movement t. *Public Relations Review*, 45:101812.
- Malone, T. W. and Crowston, K. (1994). The Interdisciplinary Study of Coordination. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 26(1):87–119.
- Martínez, J. and Durán, J. M. (2021). Software Supply Chain Attacks, a Threat to Global Cybersecurity: SolarWinds’ Case Study. *International Journal of Safety and Security Engineering*, 11(5):537–545.
- Marynissen, H. and Lauder, M. (2020). Stakeholder-Focused Communication Strategy During Crisis: A Case Study Based on the Brussels Terror Attacks. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 57(2):176–193.
- Masuch, K., Greve, M., and Trang, S. (2021). What To Do After a Data Breach? Examining Apology and Compensation as Response Strategies for Health Service Providers. *Electronic Markets*, 31:829–848.
- Mills, J. L. (2017). Privacy, Mass Intrusion and the Modern Data Breach. *Florida Law Review*, 69(3):771–830.
- Ndlela, M. N. (2019). *Crisis Communication: A Stakeholder Approach*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Nöhammer, E., Schorn, R., and Becker, N. (2023). Optimizing the Organizational Crisis Communication Portfolio. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 26:304–319.
- Palttala, P., Boano, C., Lund, R., and Vos, M. (2021). Communication Gaps in Disaster Management: Perceptions by Experts from Governmental and Non-Governmental Organizations. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 20(1):1–12.
- Park, S. and Choi, J. (2023). Comparing Public Responses to Apologies: Examining Crisis Communication Strategies Using Network Analysis and Topic Modeling. *Quality & Quantity*, 57:3603–3620.

- Racer, B. M. and Johnson, D. I. (2001). A Consumer's View of Crisis Communication: Can an Organization Benefit from Having a Response Plan? *Communication Research Reports*, 18(4):384–390.
- Raupp, J. (2019). Crisis Communication in the Rhetorical Arena. *Public Relations Review*, 45:101768.
- Ruohonen, J. and Hjerpe, K. (2022). The GDPR Enforcement Fines at Glance. *Information Systems*, 106:101876.
- Ruohonen, J., Hjerpe, K., and von Zastrow, M. (2024). An Exploratory Case Study on Data Breach Journalism. Forthcoming in the Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security (ARES 2024). Available online: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.01446>.
- Ruohonen, J., Rauti, S., Hyrynsalmi, S., and Leppänen, V. (2018). A Case Study on Software Vulnerability Coordination. *Information and Software Technology*, 103:239–257.
- Schoofs, L., Fannes, G., and Claeys, A.-S. (2022). Empathy as a Main Ingredient of Impactful Crisis Communication: The Perspectives of Crisis Communication Practitioners. *Public Relations Review*, 48:102150.
- Seeger, M. W. (2006). Best Practices in Crisis Communication: An Expert Panel Process. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 34(3):232–244.
- Shastri, S., Wasserman, M., and Chidambaram, V. (2021). GDPR Anti-Patterns. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(2):59–85.
- Syed, R. (2020). Enterprise Reputation Threats on Social Media: A Case of Data Breach Framing. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28:257–274.
- Teichmann, F. M. and Boticiu, S. R. (2024). Adequate Responses to Cyber-Attacks. *International Cybersecurity Law Review*, 5:337–345.
- Thomas, L., Gondal, I., Oseni, T., and Firmin, S. S. (2022). A Framework for Data Privacy and Security Accountability in Data Breach Communications. *Computers & Security*, 116:102657.
- Voges, T. S., Jin, Y., Buckley, C., Eaddy, L. L., and Lu, X. (2024). A New Framework for Managing “Crisis Spillover” as a Type of Sticky Crisis: Initial Insights from a Crisis Communication Expert Panel. *Public Relations Review*, 50:102424.
- Weir, G., Aßmuth, A., Whittington, M., and Duncan, B. (2017). Cloud Accounting Systems, the Audit Trail, Forensics and the EU GDPR: How Hard Can It Be? In *Proceedings of the British Accounting & Finance Association (BAFA) Annual Conference*, Edinburgh. Available online in May 2024: https://pure.strath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/72441197/Weir_et_al_BAFA2017_Cloud_accounting_systems_the_audit_trail.pdf.
- Xu, J. and Wu, Y. (2020). Countering Reactance in Crisis Communication: Incorporating Positive Emotions via Social Media. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 57(3):352–369.
- Yeboah-Ofori, A. and Islam, S. (2019). Cyber Security Threat Modeling for Supply Chain Organizational Environments. *Future Internet*, 11(3):1–25.