

## **Chapter 4**

### **Conclusion**

These findings are enough to answer the paper's research question and confirms the initial assumption. The research question is "what is the effect of social profiling in the US Presidential Election 2016" with the assumption of this analysis is that there is a significant impact caused by social profiling towards the preliminaries and campaign stages of the voting. In total, there are 4 important findings that is revealed in this paper research.

The first finding of this research indicates that the US presidential election have changed due to a capitalistic market brought by data companies. As stated in the second chapter, big data and social profiling in US Presidential Election began with Obama both in his 2008 and his 2012 campaign, where the idea of using voter's data to improve their campaign effectiveness was born in 2008 and the usage of big data and social networking was utilized in 2012. This is due to the creation of a special team that created an application that is capable to create a big data system called Narwhal, which has the purpose of being a container for all the information the team obtains through various means and processing them into a single detailed profile of each voter and can be accessed by almost anyone on the team. It is also complimented with the campaign team's very own social networking tool named Dashboard, created a simplified substitute of the field office for the campaign's field agents and volunteers to coordinate movements and activities. It has the capability and the user interface elements that closely resembles modern social media platform to encourage its use in the field. These

tools allow the Obama campaign in 2012 to micro-target voters through multiple outlets including digital advertisements and their own acquaintances.

Meanwhile, in Trump's 2016 presidential campaign, there was no specialized team to build a big data system, nobody build a dedicated in-team social media, and no big data analyst in Trump's campaign team, there was Cambridge Analytica. The data company was able to coordinate with Trump's campaign team to create a very effective digital campaign that made use of its own micro-targeting algorithm. The result of this cooperation is numerous with personalized social media advertisements changing depending on various profile factors, controlling narratives through search engine advertisements, paid advertisements that are disguised as articles in news outlet, and finally the heavy utilization of bots in social media. However, the data that is obtained by Cambridge Analytica is illegal in nature as it was obtained through a personality test application where the app promises its users to only use their data for research purposes, yet used for political campaign purposes.

Trump's use of big data and social profiling and its huge coverage in the media is clear to other politicians who are seeking to win an election be it on state level or president level creating a big data approach to political marketing to work and deemed effective. It is true that Obama was the first political candidate to do so in 2012 but it needs to be reminded that he had to build a dedicated team to create the groundwork for such a massive undertaking. The difference in 2016 are the data companies like Cambridge Analytica in which politicians do not need to have a highly expert team consisting of data analyst and computer scientist. By acquiring a reliable data company with the proper incentives, they will gladly provide all the data in the world, set-up systems and applications for the campaign team, and to even providing an advisory

team. Big data and social profiling are now its own market. The source of data would not matter, the reason media and to an extent, this paper, fuss over the 2016 election is regarding the nature of its illegal means in acquiring data. The US election game couldn't go back to where it was before big data and social profiling become prevalent. Every politician knows the potential gain of social profiling and understands if they do not use this, they will risk losing their campaign. With this, the current position of social profiling in US politics and campaigns is now an irreplaceable tool in political marketing. Their effectiveness is proven twice throughout the presidential election and its importance is nevertheless recognizable.

The second finding is that according to constructivism, social profiling has a significant impact towards the 2016 US Presidential Election. The theory dictates that social construct that defines the state's identity can be reconstructed by a huge number of people. This case analysis aligns with constructivism based upon two facts. First is that historically, Obama has won the 2012 election through similar micro-targeting algorithm methods. Secondly; and perhaps more importantly, is that previous researchers in the field of data analyst and political marketing have found that Trump's method of combining big data, social profiling, and the utilization of bot accounts along with very effective and aggressive big data system was critical in his victory due to the number of engagement and reaction it was able to create in the social network by making use of popular keywords and important events. Since both shows a correlation between social profiling, big data, and supports in the campaign, fulfills the requirement of constructivism theory. The next finding is that in accordance with digital rights, millions of American voters' digital privacy rights were violated by both Trump and his aide, Cambridge Analytica. There are three reasons for this conclusion, first being

the illegal nature of how the data is obtained, secondly was the lack of protection of user data in social media, and the lastly is the usage of these data for personal interest without consent. According to digital human rights, this is enough to declare a breach of privacy in the digital landscape.

Lastly, this paper discovers the fact that United States' law that governs privacy is next to nothing in accordance to digital rights. This is due to not having an act that is specifically made for digital privacy. The closest thing they have is the FTC Act of 1914 which is inadequate in dealing with privacy breach because there are many loopholes that can be exploited. To address this, the US has to follow the example of other figures such as European Union and the GDPR - a modern privacy law that is effective to all member countries of the Union. Until this is addressed, the United States privacy protection of their own citizens will remain incompetent.

The election game has changed, by surmising the four discovery of this paper, social profiling has altered the strategy of the preliminaries. The changes came from how social profiling and big data affects the individuals, millions of American voters who were persuaded through their own digital footprints that were obtained through deceit and violation of privacy, and that data reveals who they are and how they can be influenced. Through the sheer number of voters that were influenced, the social construct can be affected enough to gain a substantial advantage in political elections due to how effective it is. This is how social profiling could affect presidential elections, or any election for that matter. Presidential candidates are going to be hiring big data companies and analyst as the basis of their political marketing. With big data, social profiling, and algorithm, their campaign strategy will be more effective in preserving their narrative and therefore maintaining their loyal patron and acquire new supporters.

This is why United States needs to address the issue of data privacy of their citizen. There is a possibility that the people's digital privacy rights are going to be violated again if something like this is repeated in the future.

Importance of this topic in the sphere of international relation lies in the possibility that foreign actors, from individuals to state, could influence another nation in great numbers and therefore affecting the social construct and identity of a state. This is possible through carefully planning big data researches and well-constructed social profile campaign is a real possibility, especially with how well the field of big data analyst can be implemented along with the existence of big data companies also popularizing such phenomenon. This paper can be a groundwork for an even more detailed analysis by people who are certainly more qualified.

With that, the researcher realizes that there are shortcomings on the paper due to various issue. There are four findings in this paper but the strength of each discovery varies. The weakest of the four finding is the second finding about how social profiling affects US Presidential Election 2016, this is not due to the lack of data but instead due to the researcher's lack of capability in the field of big data research and computer science, making the author not being able to process the necessary data, instead the paper relies on the data that is available from previous researches from more capable analyst and experts in the related field to refine important data. On the other hand, the strongest finding on this paper is on the fourth result. It is compelling due to the fact that the data are textual and purely qualitative which in turn is relatively easier to process with the inductive method by comparing it to the digital rights concept. Not to mention, the fourth result is regarding the quality of the US laws for digital privacy which is anchored on reality and not a high concept discussion, making it the strongest

case this paper made. There are also some problems within the paper itself. First, the writer realizes its own limited knowledge due to age and level of education therefore there might be some explanations that are not quite clear. This also extends to the limited knowledge of its writer; the research question and topic is not too advanced nor detailed, one could include more segregated elements such as age, gender, or even economic and academic status. Creating a more detailed research question could provide a better insight to the issue of the effect of social profiling to voters.

## Bibliography

### Book

- Barendt, Eric M. *Freedom of Speech*. 2nd ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Brown, Chris, and Kirsten Ainley. *Understanding International Relations*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Burchill, Scott, and Christian Reus-Smith. "Constructivism." Essay. In *Theories of International Relations*, 5th ed., 217–39. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Chernoff, Fred. *Theory and Metatheory in International Relations: Concepts and Contending Accounts*. New York City, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Creswell, John W., and J. David. Creswell. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2018.
- Flockhart, Trine. "Constructivism and Foreign Policy." Essay. In *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, edited by Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield, and Timothy Dunne, 3rd ed., 79–94. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Fuchs, Christian. *Social Media: A Critical Introduction*. Los Angeles, California: Sage, 2017.
- Lister, Martin, Jon Dovey, Seth Giddings, Iain Grant, and Kieran Kelly. *New Media: a Critical Introduction*. 2nd ed. London, England: Routledge, 2010.
- McKee, Alan. *Textual Analysis a Beginner's Guide*. London, England: Sage Publications, 2003.
- Sandel, Michael J. *Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?* New York, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010.
- Searle, John R. *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York City, New York: Free Press, 2007.
- Thussu, Daya Kishan. *International Communication: Continuity and Change*. London, England: Hodder Arnold, 2006.
- Vincent, R. J. *Human Rights and International Relations*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Wendt, Alexander. *Social Theory of International Politics*. New York City, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

### **Journals and Publications**

Lucchi, Nicola. "Access to Network Services and Protection of Constitutional Rights: Recognizing the Essential Role of Internet Access for the Freedom of Expression." *Cardozo Journal of International and Comparative Law* 19, no. 3 (2011).

[https://doi.org/https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1756243](https://doi.org/https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1756243).

Allen, Mike. "Internet Research and Ethical Decision Making." *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, December 19, 2018, 788–89. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411.n271>.

Bessi, Alessandro, and Emilio Ferrara. "Social Bots Distort the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election Online Discussion." *First Monday* 21, no. 11 (November 7, 2016). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v21i11.7090>.

Bilal, Muhammad, Abdullah Gani, Muhammad Ikram Lali, Mohsen Marjani, and Nadia Malik. "Social Profiling: A Review, Taxonomy, and Challenges." *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 22, no. 7 (July 10, 2019): 433–50. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2018.0670>.

Buccoliero, Luca, Elena Bellio, Giulia Crestini, and Alessandra Arkoudas. "Twitter and Politics: Evidence from the US Presidential Elections 2016." *Journal of Marketing Communications* 26, no. 1 (August 16, 2018): 88–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2018.1504228>.

Caranti, Luigi. "Kant's Theory of Human Rights." Edited by Thomas Cushman. *Handbook of Human Rights*, September 8, 2011, 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887035.ch3>.

Dower, Nigel. "Human Rights and International Relations." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 1, no. 1 (1997): 86–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642989708406655>.

González, Roberto J. "Hacking the Citizenry?: Personality Profiling, 'Big Data' and the Election of Donald Trump." *Anthropology Today* 33, no. 3 (2017): 9–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8322.12348>.

Hegazy, Islam Mohamed. "The Effect of Political Neuromarketing 2.0 on Election Outcomes." *Review of Economics and Political Science* ahead-of-print, no. ahead-of-print (October 26, 2019): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/rep-06-2019-0090>.

- Hindman, Matthew. "Disinformation, 'Fake News' and Influence Campaigns on Twitter." Knight Foundation. Knight Foundation, October 2018.  
<https://knightfoundation.org/reports/disinformation-fake-news-and-influence-campaigns-on-twitter/>.
- Milan, Stefania. "When Algorithms Shape Collective Action: Social Media and the Dynamics of Cloud Protesting." *Social Media + Society* 1, no. 2 (2015): 1–10.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115622481>.
- Riahi, Youssra, and Sara Riahi. "Big Data and Big Data Analytics: Concepts, Types and Technologies." *International Journal of Research and Engineering* 5, no. 9 (2018): 524–28. <https://doi.org/10.21276/ijre.2018.5.9.5>.
- Ruggie, John Gerard. "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 855–85. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550770>.
- Thomas, David R. "A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data." *American Journal of Evaluation* 27, no. 2 (2006): 237–46.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>.
- Vicario, Michela Del, Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Fabio Petroni, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, H. Eugene Stanley, and Walter Quattrociocchi. "The Spreading of Misinformation Online." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113, no. 3 (January 19, 2016): 554–59.  
<https://doi.org/www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1517441113>.
- Wagner, Wolfgang. "International Relations Theories and Human Rights." Edited by Anja Mihr and Mark Gibney. *The SAGE Handbook of Human Rights*, 2014, 105–22. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473909335.n7>.
- Walt, Stephen M. "International Relations: One World, Many Theories." *Foreign Policy*, no. 110 (1998): 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1149275>.
- Yaqub, Ussama, Soon Ae Chun, Vijayalakshmi Atluri, and Jaideep Vaidya. "Analysis of Political Discourse on Twitter in the Context of the 2016 US Presidential Elections." *Government Information Quarterly* 34, no. 4 (November 13, 2017): 613–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2017.11.001>.

## Website

- ABC News. "Facebook Says 300,000 Australians May Have Had Their Data 'Improperly Shared'." ABC News. ABC News, April 4, 2018.  
<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-04-05/facebook-raises-cambridge-analytica-estimates/9620652>.

- Balz, Dan. "How the Obama Campaign Won the Race for Voter Data." The Washington Post. WP Company, July 28, 2013. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/how-the-obama-campaign-won-the-race-for-voter-data/2013/07/28/ad32c7b4-ee4e-11e2-a1f9-ea873b7e0424\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/how-the-obama-campaign-won-the-race-for-voter-data/2013/07/28/ad32c7b4-ee4e-11e2-a1f9-ea873b7e0424_story.html).
- BBC. "How Do the US Presidential Elections Work?" BBC Bitesize. BBC, October 13, 2020. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/articles/z9d43j6>.
- Bredemeier, Ken. "How Did Trump Win Election While Losing Popular Vote?" Voice of America. VOA News, November 11, 2016. <https://www.voanews.com/usa/us-politics/how-did-trump-win-election-while-losing-popular-vote>.
- British Broadcasting Corporation. "US Election 2016 Results." BBC News. BBC, December 13, 2016. <https://www.bbc.com/news/election/us2016/results>.
- Cadwalladr, Carol, and Emma Graham-Harrison. "Revealed: 50 Million Facebook Profiles Harvested for Cambridge Analytica in Major Data Breach." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, March 17, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/17/cambridge-analytica-facebook-influence-us-election>.
- Clement, J. "Most Used Social Media Platform." Statista. Statista, August 21, 2020. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>.
- Detrow, Scott. "What Did Cambridge Analytica Do During The 2016 Election?" NPR. NPR, March 20, 2018. <https://www.npr.org/2018/03/20/595338116/what-did-cambridge-analytica-do-during-the-2016-election>.
- Davies, Harry. "Ted Cruz Campaign Using Firm That Harvested Data on Millions of Unwitting Facebook Users." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, December 11, 2015. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/dec/11/senator-ted-cruz-president-campaign-facebook-user-data>.
- Gallagher, Sean. "Built to Win: Deep inside Obama's Campaign Tech." Ars Technica. Ars Technica, November 14, 2012. <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2012/11/built-to-win-deep-inside-obamas-campaign-tech/2/>.
- Green, Andy. "Complete Guide to Privacy Laws in the US." Inside Out Security. Varonis, February 4, 2021. <https://www.varonis.com/blog/us-privacy-laws/>.
- Human Rights Watch. "Human Rights in the Digital Age." Just Security. Human Rights Watch, December 23, 2014. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2014/12/23/human-rights-digital-age>.

- Hutt, Rosamond. "What Are Your Digital Rights?" World Economic Forum. World Economic Forum, November 13, 2015.  
<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/11/what-are-your-digital-rights-explainer/>.
- Issenberg, Sasha. "How Obama's Team Used Big Data to Rally Voters." MIT Technology Review. MIT Technology Review, December 19, 2012.  
<https://www.technologyreview.com/2012/12/19/114510/how-obamas-team-used-big-data-to-rally-voters/>.
- Issenberg, Sasha. "How the Obama Campaign's Top-Secret Project Narwhal Will Change the 2012 Race." Slate Magazine. Slate, February 15, 2012.  
<https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2012/02/project-narwhal-how-a-top-secret-obama-campaign-program-could-change-the-2012-race.html>.
- Kelly, Matthew. "Before Trump, Cambridge Analytica Was on Team Cruz." OpenSecrets News. Center for Responsive Politics, March 23, 2018.  
<https://www.opensecrets.org/news/2018/03/before-trump-cambridge-analytica-was-on-team-cruz/>.
- Lewis, Paul, and Paul Hilder. "Leaked: Cambridge Analytica's Blueprint for Trump Victory." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, March 23, 2018.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2018/mar/23/leaked-cambridge-analyticas-blueprint-for-trump-victory>.
- Osborne, Hilary. "What Is Cambridge Analytica? The Firm at the Centre of Facebook's Data Breach." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, March 18, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/18/what-is-cambridge-analytica-firm-at-centre-of-facebook-data-breach>.
- Osborne, Hillary. "What Is Cambridge Analytica? The Firm at the Centre of Facebook's Data Breach." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, March 18, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/18/what-is-cambridge-analytica-firm-at-centre-of-facebook-data-breach>.
- Overby, Peter. "Cambridge Analytica's Role In Trump's 2016 Campaign Raises Potential Legal Flags." NPR. NPR, March 21, 2018.  
<https://www.npr.org/2018/03/21/595535935/cambridge-analyticas-role-in-trump-s-2016-campaign-raises-potential-legal-flags>.
- Politico. "2016 Election Results: President Live Map by State, Real-Time Voting Updates." Election Hub. Politico, December 13, 2016.  
<https://www.politico.com/2016-election/results/map/president/>.
- Siatitsa, Iliia. "Article 12: The Right to Privacy." Digital Rights are Human Rights. Digital Freedom Fund, December 10, 2020.

<https://digitalfreedomfund.org/digital-rights-are-human-rights/article-12-the-right-to-privacy/>.

Wu, Tim. "Is the First Amendment Obsolete?" Knight First Amendment Institute. Columbia University, September 1, 2017.  
<https://knightcolumbia.org/content/tim-wu-first-amendment-obsolete>.

### **Video**

Rhodes, Larissa. *The Social Dilemma*. United States: Netflix, 2020.