

ABSTRACT

Creating Vocal Advocates on Twitter: Examining the Importance of Purpose in Social Media Communication

Alyssa B. Gonzalez, M.A.

Mentor: Marlene S. Neill, Ph.D.

Social media is a powerful tool for organizations to build relationships, promote services and encourage community activism. Through content analysis, this study investigates which types of messaging on Twitter are effective in turning members of the public into vocal advocates for education-based nonprofits. The study identifies current Twitter practices among the organizations and describes how they can influence social change. The situational theory of publics is used to analyze online engagement. This study also examines the importance of organization-public relationships and their utilization on social media platforms to promote advocacy. Findings revealed that informational posts are the most frequently used form of messaging by education-based nonprofits on Twitter and are the most successful in garnering engagement. Education-based nonprofits prefer to have a majority of their tweets originate from their organization. Furthermore, they are utilizing Twitter's other media related tools by including links in 65 percent of their posts.

Creating Vocal Advocates on Twitter:
Examining the Importance of Purpose in Social Media Communication

by

Alyssa Gonzalez, B.A.

A Thesis

Approved by the Department of Journalism, Public Relations and New Media

Sara Stone, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts

Approved by Thesis Committee

Marlene Neill, Ph.D., Chairperson

Mia Moody-Ramirez, Ph.D.

Daniel Shafer, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
December 2018

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2018 by Alyssa B. Gonzalez

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
DEDICATION	vii
CHAPTER ONE	1
Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER TWO	6
Literature Review.....	6
<i>Organization-Public Relationships</i>	6
<i>Situational Theory of Publics</i>	9
<i>Nonprofit Organizations and Social Media</i>	11
<i>How Nonprofits Use Twitter</i>	13
CHAPTER THREE.....	15
Methods	15
CHAPTER FOUR.....	19
Results and Discussion	19
<i>Results</i>	19
<i>Discussion</i>	22
CHAPTER FIVE.....	29
Limitations and Conclusion	29
<i>Limitations</i>	29
<i>Conclusion</i>	31
APPENDICES	33
Appendix A: Coding Instrument.....	34
Appendix B: Codebook	36
Appendix C: Sample Tweets	38
Appendix D: Frequency and Descriptive Statistics	40
Appendix E: General Linear Multivariate Test	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure C.1. Example of informational Twitter post.....	38
Figure C.2. Example of community-building Twitter post	39
Figure C.3. Example of promotion and mobilization Twitter post.....	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table D.1. <i>Tweet Origin Frequency</i>	40
Table D.2. <i>Retweet Source Frequency</i>	40
Table D.3. <i>Tweet Message/Purpose Frequency</i>	40
Table D.4. <i>Type of Visual Frequency</i>	41
Table D.5. <i>Visual Content Component Frequency</i>	41
Table D.6. <i>Tone Frequency</i>	41
Table D.7. <i>Use of Link Frequency</i>	42
Table D.8. <i>Descriptive Statistics Comparing Message Type and Engagement Type</i>	42
Table E.1. <i>Between-Subjects Factors</i>	43
Table E.2 <i>General Linear Multivariate Test</i>	43
Table E.3 <i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>	44

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Marlene Neill for her support and guidance throughout the course of my research. Her knowledge and insight were fundamental in helping me explore different paths and cultivate new ideas.

I would also like to recognize Dr. Mia Moody-Ramirez, whose theory of mass communication class motivated me to begin this project. Thank you for facilitating the initial stages of this study, helping me build the foundation of my research and guiding me as I developed it further.

Another member of my committee, Dr. Daniel Shafer, was instrumental in the statistical analysis of my data. I am exceedingly appreciative of his assistance reviewing my data and determining the best method of analysis.

Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude to my parents. My dad's involvement in the nonprofit organization, Readers 2 Leaders, and passion for education served as the inspiration for this study. Additionally, I am grateful to my mom, who spent countless hours with me coding and re-coding data. Their selflessness and love are never-ending.

DEDICATION

To my husband, Cameron, for being my constant source of love and encouragement; and to my incredible parents, Frank and Ana, who taught me how to be strong in the face of a challenge. Thank you for always believing in me, supporting me and motivating me to do my best. I am forever blessed by your presence in my life.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Education-based nonprofits are an essential component in the improvement of school systems and increase the potential for students to receive a quality education. Rankings from the 2017 U.S. News Best High Schools discovered graduation rates as low as 65.8 percent (Boyington, 2017). Through the use of social media, nonprofit organizations have the opportunity to garner awareness and encourage the public to get involved. Twitter, as one of the top social media networks with more than 330 million monthly active monthly users, is a powerful platform for nonprofit organizations to communicate and create relationships with the public (Aslam, 2018).

Education-based nonprofits aim to improve educational systems by providing services to teachers, parents and students (Bennett, 2011). Some services include training or professional development for teachers and educational leaders, engagement activities for parents and tutoring opportunities for students. Many education-based nonprofits also place an emphasis on providing services to lower income families and minorities (Bennett, 2011).

Social media has become an important means of communication for nonprofit organizations, providing the opportunity for them to share information about the services they provide as well as build relationships with the community. Technology has been recognized as a tool for relationship building since the 1990s (Saffer, Sommerfeldt & Taylor, 2013). Previous research by Kent and Taylor (1998) indicated that “it is how the

technology is used that influences organization–public relationships” (p. 324). Today, the current focus for public relations practitioners and many organizations is relationship building through social media platforms. Saffer et al. (2013) found that Twitter provides the opportunity for organizations to engage in contingency interactivity with the public, “providing the kind of relationship-building communication that has been missing from websites” (Saffer et al., 2013, p. 213). In order to assess the importance of relationships between education-based nonprofit organizations and the public on Twitter, organization-public relationships were examined in this study.

Previous research indicates that nonprofit organizations tend to use Twitter for one-way message communication (Lovejoy, Waters, & Saxton 2012; Waters, Burnett, Lamm, & Lucas 2009; Waters & Jamal 2011; Xifra & Grau 2010). “Rather than using public messages to reply to other Twitter users or connecting to others by retweeting messages that may be helpful to others, nonprofits are primarily using the site to relay information using one-way communication” (Lovejoy et al., 2012, p. 317). In regard to message content, previous research conducted in 2013 by Saxton and Guo revealed that the majority of the tweets were aimed at providing information to stakeholders, followed by building an online community and then calling that community to action. Studies have furthermore concluded organizations are only limited in how they use Twitter by the imaginations of their communicators (Lovejoy et al., 2012).

Research examining other forms of messaging and communication by organizations on social media also have been conducted. A recent study by Saxton and Waters (2014) examined what information stakeholders engaged with and shared on Facebook. The study conversely found nonprofits' Facebook publics are more receptive

to community-building and call-to-action messages. In contrast to a prior study by Lovejoy and Saxton (2012), which found that information-sharing can be far-reaching, boost accountability and public trust, Saxton and Waters' (2014) research found that one-way messaging such as event promotion, fundraising messages and informational messages were less successful in garnering audience engagement. Saxton and Waters (2014) concluded community-building messages are perceived more favorably and attract considerably more comments than informational messages because they facilitate back-and-forth exchanges.

However, how the public processes and reacts to these different types of messages on social media can have a direct impact on their level of engagement. The elaboration likelihood model of advertising reception, or ELM, suggests that the attitude of the public towards a message or post is formed either by their central route of processing or their peripheral route (Thorson, 1996). The central route is a cognitive process of evaluation, which allows the public to detect the argument of a message and examine it for quality (Thorson, 1996). The central route has a high involvement rate, which can result in high social media engagement. Conversely, the peripheral route is a superficial analysis that results in low consumer involvement and engagement (Thorson, 1996). ELM theory has also been used to analyze online persuasion (Cyr, Head, Lim, & Stibe, 2018; SanJosé-Cabezudo, Gutiérrez-Arranz, & Gutiérrez-Cillán, 2009). Cyr et al. (2018) found that the use of images online contributed to change in issue involvement and ultimately attitude change. This finding proposes that images can be a persuasive tool for engaging with online communities and encouraging a central route of processing. Cyr et al. (2018) also

suggests the element of connectedness is key to creating positive online relations, which lead to trust, loyalty and user enjoyment.

Furthermore, the situational theory of publics states individuals can react to messages in one of two ways— either through information seeking or information processing (Aldoory, Kim & Tindall, 2010). These two methods of responding to information, seen as dependent variables in the theory, are important in identifying active publics. Active publics are those who are impacted by an issue or post and choose to engage or get involved. When active publics respond to a message, this results in an increased likelihood to engage in a conversation about a topic or get involved in a situation. As active publics become increasingly involved with an organization on Twitter, they are more likely to develop into a vocal advocate for the organization by engaging in and sharing posts with their own social circles. A previous study found that “if we observe an actively communicating public, we soon realize that its members engage not only in active information seeking but also in active information sharing and selecting” (Kim & Grunig, 2011, p. 122). The theory also examines three independent variables— problem recognition, obstacles to participation and involvement with the issue, all of which influence information seeking and information processing (Aldoory et al., 2010). The situational theory of publics is valuable in assisting public relations professionals, as well as any organization, in determining how messages appeal to their target audiences. This information can be used to increase the effectiveness of social media messaging and provide valuable insight into how to convert nonpublics (those publics who are not impacted by an issue) into active publics online.

Although information is known about how nonprofit organizations are using Twitter, there is little research pertaining to how target audiences respond to different types of messaging. Prior research concerning social media use by nonprofit organizations indicates there is a gap between sending out information and creating dialogue (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Lovejoy, Waters & Saxton, 2012; Waters, Burnett, Lamm & Lucas 2009; Xifra & Grau, 2010). This study explores how nonprofits are currently communicating on Twitter and what messages they are using to motivate users to become active publics. Building on previous research surrounding social media use by nonprofit organizations, this study focuses specifically on procuring an in-depth content analysis of education-based nonprofit organizations' use of Twitter. The purpose of this study is to develop an understanding of current Twitter practices among education-based nonprofit organizations and to determine how they can influence social change by creating vocal advocates for their cause. This information will be valuable for all nonprofit organizations using social media who wish to increase their active publics and transform their followers into vocal advocates. This study is furthermore beneficial to any organization interested in learning more about their social media audience and how to develop messages which will best appeal to it.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

As a theoretical foundation for this study, literature regarding organization-public relationships and situational theory of publics were examined. These theories highlight the importance of relationship-building as well as information seeking and processing. Concepts introduced by situational theory of publics are consistent with the elaboration likelihood model of advertising reception, which details two information processing routes that form public attitudes and effect involvement. Finally, an overview of recent research of nonprofits' use of social media is provided.

Organization-Public Relationships

The topic of relationship management studies between organizations and the public as a central aspect of public relations was first developed by Ferguson (1984), contending relationships should be the primary unit of analysis in public relations. Following Ferguson's concept of the importance of relationships, the need to define these relationships in public relations was then emphasized by Broom, Casey and Ritchey (1997). The study concluded, "Although those who practice and study public relations talk about relationships as a focal concept, few have defined the concept or have carefully measured attributes of relationships themselves" (Broom et al., 1997, p. 85).

Ledingham and Bruning (1998), in response, defined organization-public relationships as "the state which exists between an organization and its key publics in which the actions of either entity impact the economic, social, political and/or cultural

well-being of the other entity” (p. 62). They defined the five dimensions of organization-public relationships: trust, openness, involvement, investment, and commitment. Hon and Grunig (1999) then refined these dimensions and contended in order to measure the quality of a relationship the following dimensions must be examined—public trust, control mutuality, satisfaction, and commitment. Trust is defined as “one party’s level of confidence in and willingness to open oneself to the other party” (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 3). Control mutuality is described as when the public and an organization agree on their mutual influence on each other. “Satisfaction is achieved when the publics favor the organization due to fulfillment of set, positive expectations, while commitment to an organization occurs when the publics value the relationship and have an inherent need to maintain and strengthen it” (Men & Muralidharan, 2016, p. 87).

In order to create effective organization-public relationships, it is vital that the relationship be beneficial to all parties involved. Ledingham and Bruning (1998) found that relationships flourished when the following characteristics were present: balance, commitment, openness, and trust. Technology creates the opportunity for organizations to develop a more balanced relationship with the public. Social media, specifically, is a tool allowing a constant flow of direct communication between organizations and the public.

There are, however, several factors that need to take place in order for organizations to develop a welcoming online environment in which a successful and effective relationship with the public can be fostered. Hallahan (2004) documented the factors essential to the process of creating organization-public relationships online, including building awareness and adoption, creating opportunities for interaction and impression formation. Building awareness and adoption on social media can be

interpreted as sharing information about an organization or following the organization (Hallahan, 2004). Opportunities for interaction occur when community-building tweets are posted, encouraging online users to join the conversation (Hallahan, 2004).

Impressions can be formed on users by tweets which motivate users to process and interpret information in a positive manner (Hallahan, 2004). This can result in the user also having a positive impression of the organization as well.

Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) developed three classifications to describe the function of Twitter posts, these include informational tweets, community-building tweets and promotion and mobilization tweets. Informational tweets are those whose purpose is “spreading information about the organization, its activities or anything of potential interest to followers” (p. 341). These tweets can encourage the public to share knowledge about the organization and its services. Community-building messages are those which attempt to build relationships, networks and communities with followers by promoting interactivity and dialogue (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). The objective of promotion and mobilization tweets is to encourage followers to get involved, act on behalf of the organization, donate, volunteer, attend an event or use their services (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). In order to examine organization-public relationships by education-based nonprofit organizations on Twitter, this study will determine how elements of relationships are used in messaging in Twitter posts. The primary purpose of the messaging on each post will be classified into one of three relationship-oriented categories- informational tweets, community-building tweets or promotional and mobilization tweets (Guidry et al., 2014).

Creating organization-public relationships online has several benefits including increased public knowledge of the organization, positive attitudes toward the organization and increased online communication activity (Hallahan, 2004). Prior research also has found perceptions of relational strategies online are highly correlated with perceptions of relational outcomes such as trust, satisfaction, control mutuality, and commitment (Kelleher & Miller, 2006).

Furthermore, scholars have found those who were deeply engaged with an organization on social media also displayed a higher degree of trust, satisfaction and commitment to the organization (Bortree, 2011; Bruce & Shelley, 2010; Men & Tsai, 2014). Men and Tsai (2014) discovered publics who are more engaged with organizations on social media perceive those organizations as genuine and transparent. Social media engagement by the public with education-based nonprofit organizations has the power to develop positive organization-public relationships. In this study, organization-public relationships will be used to examine the messaging purpose used in tweets and the importance of the relationships between education-based nonprofit organizations and the public. It will also be used to inform how these messages can build relationships online and develop a sense of community on social media platforms.

Situational Theory of Publics

The situational theory of publics examines how individuals can transform into vocal advocates, or active publics, by focusing on three independent variables: problem recognition, obstacles to participation and involvement with the issue (Aldoory et al., 2010). These are said to predict two dependent variables: information seeking and information processing (Aldoory et al., 2010). The independent variable of problem

recognition is defined as “the moment when people recognize that something should be done about an issue or situation and stop and think about what to do” (Guidry et al., 2014, p.242). Obstacles to participation occur when people perceive there may be difficulties in the way of acting to remedy a problem, and level of involvement is the extent people connect with the issue or situation (Grunig, 1997).

Similarly, the elaboration likelihood model of advertising reception, or ELM which was first introduced by Petty & Cacioppo (1979), suggests that the attitude of the public towards a message or post is formed either by a central route of processing or their peripheral route. The central route, a cognitive process of evaluation on message purpose and quality (Thorson, 1996), not only allows the public to recognize the importance or problem discussed in a post, but also what the obstacles will be in participating. This processing route creates a deeper level of understanding and can result in a higher involvement rate (Thorson, 1996). The peripheral route is a superficial analysis that generates less comprehension of an issue, which decreases the likelihood that the public will participate in the conversation or get involved with the issue. This route results in low consumer involvement and engagement (Thorson, 1996).

The dependent variables of the situational theory of publics, information seeking and processing, can reflect passive or active forms of communication. The nature of communication response by users can significantly influence the effectiveness of social marketing efforts (Guidry et al., 2014). Passive levels of information seeking or the ELM peripheral processing, for example, may be when an individual simply receives or consumes information that is presented to them. A converse example of an active level of information seeking or the ELM central route processing could be when individuals put

effort into locating or consuming specific information and choose to get involved by commenting on or sharing a post. Grunig (1989) found that people who communicate actively are more likely to feel a certain way about a situation and, as a result, will be more likely to engage in a conversation about the topic or get involved in the situation. Based on these variables, individuals can be considered active publics or nonpublics, those publics who are not impacted by an issue.

The situational theory of publics, along with the ELM, provides a framework for exploring factors involved in determining publics' attitudes and behaviors toward an organization based on perceptions of an issue (Grunig, 1989; Hamilton, 1992). These theories will be used as a source to explore how organizations can approach different types of publics in order to increase engagement and involvement with an organization (Grunig, 1997). The situational theory of publics proposes persuasive communication can influence an individual's behavior and ultimately influence them to become a supporter of an issue or idea as a result of well-planned and well-developed messages (Guidry et al., 2014).

Nonprofit Organizations and Social Media

A nonprofit, or not for profit, organization is a voluntary organization formed to further cultural, educational, religious, professional or public service objectives (Boris & Mosher-Williams, 1998). Startup funding for these organizations generally comes from members of the organization, who do not typically expect reimbursement and do not benefit from the revenue gained by the organization. Nonprofit organizations are also usually granted tax exemptions, and donations made to the organization are often tax deductible. Nonprofits prefer that most of the revenue they receive from donations be

used to further their overall objective rather than for advertisements. As a result, many nonprofit organizations utilize the reach, communication potential and low cost of creating social media accounts to not only advertise to consumers, but also share information with current and future members of their social community.

First appearing in the mid-to-late 2000s, social media sites such as Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter allow individuals and organizations to participate in online discussions, connect with others, and create and share information (Saxton & Wang, 2014). These modern social networking sites are distinguishable from prior forms of new media by their greater degree of user involvement and interactivity (Saxton & Wang, 2014). Twitter specifically is a micro-blogging or short message service launched in 2006. As of 2018, Twitter claims more than 330 million monthly active users, who collectively share 500 million tweets per day (Aslam, 2018). Although messages, or tweets, are restricted in length to 280 characters, users of the service are able to share real-time messages, which can be accessed worldwide.

The use of social media by brands and organizations has created new opportunities to connect with a variety of audiences. New media as a whole has significantly increased nonprofits' ability to communicate with clients, volunteers, stakeholders, the media, and the general public (Waters, 2007). Social media also can provide real-time feedback about products, services and campaigns. Most social media platforms, including Facebook and Twitter, integrate formal social networks, whereby organizations and individuals create ties to other users of their choosing by following them. Another prominent feature of social media sites are updating and messaging capabilities—the brief, regularly sent statuses, updates, photos, or tweets that are shared

from user to user (Saxton & Waters, 2014). It is the combination of these features that facilitate two-way communication between an organization and its network of followers (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Waters et al., 2009). Several studies concerning social media use by nonprofits have, however, indicated a gap between distributing information and creating dialogue (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Lovejoy, Waters, & Saxton, 2012; Waters, Burnett, Lamm, & Lucas, 2009; Xifra & Grau, 2010).

How Nonprofits Use Twitter

One-way communication is still the most pronounced form of messaging strategy used by nonprofit organizations on Twitter (Waters & Jamal, 2011). Previous research on Twitter usage found that organizations frequently sent out informational messages in an attempt to encourage engagement with followers, though rarely succeeding. Other studies focus on the characteristics of nonprofits' Twitter usage by investigating factors such as message characteristics and profile content, rather than customary measures of engagement, such as likes, comments and shares (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Waters & Jamal, 2011). These studies found that nonprofit organizations primarily use Twitter for one-way messages and fail to capitalize on the interactive nature of the social media platform (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Waters & Jamal, 2011). A study conducted in 2012, analyzing Twitter engagement of leading nonprofit organizations in the U.S. health sector, found in relation to the use of hashtags and retweeting, these organizations are still in need of best practice guidelines for Twitter in order to better engage with their publics (Messner, Jin, Medina-Messner, Meganck, Quarforth, & Norton, 2013).

Studies also focused on how nonprofits use specific Twitter communication functions (Guidry, Waters & Saxton, 2014; Guo & Saxton, 2014; Lovejoy &

Saxton, 2012). A study of the Nonprofit Times 100 organizations with Twitter accounts found 68 percent of the tweets in their sample included hyperlinks — a considerably higher percentage than the average Twitter user (Lovejoy, 2012). This study also found the sampled nonprofits used public messages addressed directly to specific Twitter users (e.g. any message that started with the @ symbol) more frequently than found in previous studies (Guidry et al., 2014). The retweet function was used less by the nonprofit organizations than among Twitter users in general — only 16.2 percent of the total number of tweets studied by Lovejoy et al. (2012) shared other users' tweets.

Another study, which included 188 advocacy organizations, found more than 60 percent of all tweets in the study contained one or more hashtags. This is more than double than those found by Lovejoy's et al. (2012) study (Guo & Saxton, 2014). It also found that 22.4 percent of tweets in the sample were retweets — again, higher than the 16.2 percent found in the study of Nonprofit Times 100 organizations (Lovejoy et al., 2012). The review of the literature leads to the following research questions:

RQ1: How are education-based nonprofit organizations currently using Twitter?

RQ2: To what degree are each type of messaging (informational, community-based and promotion and mobilization) used by education-based nonprofit organizations?

RQ3: Which type of messaging (informational, community-based and promotion and mobilization) on Twitter is the most influential in creating active publics for education-based nonprofits?

RQ4: What visual and media content are used most frequently by education-based nonprofit organizations?

CHAPTER THREE

Methods

To understand how education-based nonprofits use Twitter, the researcher conducted a content analysis of their tweets. Content analyses have been used in similar studies involving social media communication (Guidry, Waters & Saxton, 2014; Guo & Saxton, 2014; Lovejoy, Waters & Saxton, 2012; Waters & Jamal 2011; Xifra & Grau, 2010). The quantification of findings within a content analysis study “allows researchers to use techniques to summarize and investigate findings, increasing the potential for uncovering underlying relationships in the data” (Davis, 1997, p. 393). Based on the research questions and focus on social media communication, it was determined that content analysis is an appropriate methodology for this study.

The sample was selected from a crowd-funded research list of the top 16 nationally ranked education-based nonprofit organizations compiled by Philanthropedia. The mission of Philanthropedia is to improve nonprofit effectiveness by directing money to and facilitating discussion about expert recommended high-impact nonprofits. Philanthropedia created its independent research and rankings to offer a perspective of nonprofit impact as observed by sector experts. Additionally, Philanthropedia is a division of GuideStar, an online database that aims to “revolutionize philanthropy by providing information that advances transparency, enables users to make better decisions, and encourages charitable giving” (GuideStar, 2018). GuideStar serves as an information portal, gathering and disseminating details about every IRS-registered

nonprofit organization. It provides information about each nonprofit's mission, legitimacy, impact, reputation, finances, programs, transparency and governance.

In order to compile this list, national education experts were asked to recommend nonprofits working on the following topics: literacy, school readiness, school reform, the achievement gap, human capital, instructional improvement, curricular content development, low-performing school turnarounds, data, standards and assessments, after school programming, summer programming, and parental involvement at the early education through the secondary level (Philanthropedia, 2009). National education experts from 54 organizations with an average of 22 years of experience were asked to compile a list of the top education nonprofits nationally in 2014 (Philanthropedia, 2009). The group of 71 experts consisted of CEOs, program directors, professors and policy analysts (Philanthropedia, 2009).

From the list of the top 16 nationally ranked education-based nonprofit organizations, the top 50 percent were searched on social media to find an associated Twitter account, with all 16 operating existing accounts. To test this study's research questions a content analysis of the organizations' tweets was conducted and analyzed over the course of two months. Tweets from the top 25 percent of organizations on the list were gathered between October 1, 2017 and October 31, 2017, the month leading up to National Philanthropy Day. The Association of Fundraising Professionals defines National Philanthropy Day as a celebration of giving, volunteering and charitable engagement. "Every year, since 1986 when President Ronald Reagan first proclaimed November 15th as National Philanthropy Day, communities across the globe have

celebrated by hosting events to recognize the activities of donors, volunteers, foundations, leaders, corporations, and others engaged in philanthropy” (Nilsen).

The tweets for the next eight organizations were gathered between May 1, 2018 and May 31, 2018, the month which includes National Teacher Appreciation Day. National Teacher Appreciation Day annually brings attention to education through the celebration of teachers and their commitment to educating and investing in the future of children throughout the country. Two of the organizations in the top 50 percent of the list did not have tweets from the entire month of May available. As a result, the next two nonprofits on the list were included in the study in their place, as all of their tweets from May were accessible. On each of the days in the sample, all 988 tweets and retweets by each of the eight organizations were archived and analyzed.

The primary researcher and a coding assistant conducted the coding for this research. The coding categories used for this study were adapted from previous research (Guidry et al., 2014). Similar to Guidry, Waters and Saxton’s approach, this study implements a Twitter classification scheme based on the one developed by Lovejoy and Saxton (2012). Each of the tweets was assigned a code according to what is considered to be the post’s primary purpose: informational tweets (e.g. those spreading information about the organization, its activities or anything of potential interest to followers), community-building messages (e.g. those attempting to build relationships, networks and communities by promoting interactivity and dialogue) and promotion and mobilization (e.g. those seeking for followers to act on behalf of the organization). Consistent with Guidry, Waters and Saxton’s approach (2014), the informational and promotion and mobilization coding categories are further broken down to more

accurately reflect distinct dimensions of the messages. Informational tweets, for example, could take the nature of a public education post by making an effort to inform and educate the public about social issues broadly, or take the form of distributing information about the work the nonprofit does directly. Likewise, the promotion and mobilization messages represent three different categories: events and promotions, fundraising and call-to-action messages. All tweets in the sample were coded for message type and the level of engagement created by each tweet. Engagement was measured by metrics reported on Twitter and include retweets, as well as the number of comments and likes, each post received.

As the data was collected, coding categories related to visual content used in tweets were created as they became prevalent. The resulting visual categories included: GIFs, videos, photos, graphics and none (for those that did not possess any form of visual content). To determine which visual aspects created the most engagement, visual content was also coded for imagery type. These visual component categories consist of posts that include: people, people with text, event or place, event or place with text, illustration, illustration with text or text only. Additional data, such as the number of people following the account and number of tweets, was recorded to provide additional information on nonprofit organizations' Twitter usage.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

Results

The sampled tweets ($n = 988$) from 50 percent of the organizations listed on Philanthropedia's crowd-funded research list of the top 16 ranked national education-based nonprofit organizations, were comprised of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Knowledge is Power Program, Teach for America, The New Teacher Project, Khan Academy, New Teacher Center, Green Dot Schools and Children's Defense Fund. Together these organizations have created more than 87,000 tweets and received more than 50,000 likes. Additionally, though these organizations themselves only follow 20,000 Twitter users, they have accumulated more than two million followers.

In reference to RQ1, how education-based nonprofits are currently using Twitter, it was determined that 67 percent ($n = 662$) of tweets included in the sample were original tweets. The remaining 33 percent ($n = 326$) were considered retweets. Further investigation revealed that of the 326 retweets, 52 percent ($n = 169$) of them originated from a community related source. Additionally, 22 percent ($n = 71$) of retweets were from another education-based organization, 16 percent ($n = 54$) originated from employees of the organization and 10 percent ($n = 32$) originated from the organization's CEO. In relation to the tone, 57 percent ($n = 565$) of all tweets included in the sample were neutral, 42 percent (410 tweets) were positive and one percent ($n = 13$) was coded as negative.

The primary purpose classifications for message type, introduced by Lovejoy and Saxton (2012), were used to address RQ2 in analyzing the degree of which each message type was used. It was determined that 54 percent ($n = 532$) of tweets in the sample were informational, 25 percent ($n = 243$) were community-building and the remaining 21 percent ($n = 213$) were related to promotions and mobilization. The tweets classified as promotion and mobilization consisted of the following subcategories: events and promotions (12 percent, $n = 116$), call-to-action (9 percent, $n = 84$) and fundraising (1 percent, $n = 13$). Informational tweets received 55 ($n = 1,739$) percent more comments than community building tweets ($n = 458$) and seven percent ($n = 167$) more comments than promotion and mobilization tweets. Additionally, informational tweets received 30 percent ($n = 10,263$) more retweets than community building tweets, which received 5,137 retweets. Informational tweets also received the most likes ($n = 21,360$) followed by community-building tweets which garnered 13,181 likes and promotion and mobilization with 3,684 likes

Regarding RQ3, which determined the impact of tweets through engagement, the informational tweets received 1,739 comments, 10,263 retweets and 21,360 likes. Community building tweets received 458 comments, 5,137 retweets and 13,181 likes. Promotion/mobilization related tweets overall received 167 comments, 1,811 retweets and 3,684 likes.

In relation to RQ4, visual content categories, it was determined that over half of all tweets in the sample (51 percent, $n = 505$) included a photo. Furthermore, 19 percent ($n = 184$) included a graphic, 6 percent ($n = 56$) included a video and 2 percent ($n = 24$) included a GIF. Twenty-two percent of the sample ($n = 219$) did not use any form of

visual content. In terms of the specific imagery or visual content components, 64 percent of tweets with visual content featured people and 16 percent ($n = 120$) featured a person alongside text. Thirteen percent of visual content ($n = 97$) included illustration with text and three percent ($n = 20$) contained an illustration without text. Ten percent of tweets with visual content ($n = 81$) highlighted events or locations and another 10 percent ($n = 77$) contained text only. The tweets with visual content placed in the text only are those which displayed a text-only graphic. Another media related category measured was the use of links in Twitter posts. Of all the tweets included in the sample, 65 percent ($n = 641$) included a link and 35 percent ($n = 347$) did not.

SPSS Testing

SPSS was chosen as the analysis program for this study due to its highly regarded system for analyzing research data. In addition to frequency statistics, a general linear model multivariate test was conducted to measure the effect of each message type (informational, community-building and promotion and mobilization) on engagement (retweets, comments and likes). As the engagement data contains three dependent variables (retweets, comments and likes), it was determined that the general linear model multivariate test was the most appropriate form of analysis. Additionally, in order to compare each message type, the subgroups within the promotions and mobilization category (events and promotions, call-to-action and fundraising) were collapsed into a single group.

Overall, $n = 988$ tweets from education-based nonprofit organizations were examined over the course of 62 days during the months of October 2017 and May 2018. $n = 0$ posts were excluded from this study. A total of $n = 75$ posts from the Bill &

Melinda Gates Foundation, $n = 182$ posts from KIPP, $n = 235$ from Teach for America, $n = 172$ from TNTP, $n = 80$ from Khan Academy, $n = 44$ from the New Teacher Center, $n = 41$ from Green Dot Schools, and $n = 159$ from the Children's Defense Fund were analyzed.

Descriptive statistics from the multivariate test revealed that $n = 532$ posts were informational, $n = 243$ posts focused on community-building and $n = 213$ posts had a promotion and mobilization related message. The average amount of engagement on each message type was also noted. The average number of retweets for informational tweets was $M = 20.3$, $SD = 97.7$. The average number of retweets for community-building tweets was $M = 21.9$, $SD = 150$ and the average retweets for promotion and mobilization was $M = 9.91$, $SD = 23.9$. The average amount of comments for informational tweets was $M = 3.29$, $SD = 23.5$, for community-building it was $M = 1.87$, $SD = 5.90$, and for promotion and mobilization it was $M = .87$, $SD = 2.85$. Additionally, the average likes on informational posts were $M = 60.1$, $SD = 470$, on community-building they were $M = 54.3$, $SD = 182$, and on promotion and mobilization they were $M = 19.9$, $SD = 45.2$.

The Wilks' Lambda results from the multivariate test revealed that the effect of message type on engagement was not significant ($p = .321$). In terms of between-subject effects, the significance for message purpose on each engagement was $p = .394$ for retweets, $p = .201$ for comments, and $p = .374$ on likes.

Discussion

This study found that education-based nonprofit organizations currently prefer to have a majority of their posts originate from their own organization. However, they also share a significant number of retweets or posts which originate from other sources.

Concerning retweets, education-based nonprofit organizations prefer to retweet members of their community (their followers) the most. This assists in developing conversations with their followers as well as creates the opportunity for their followers to feel that they are an important member of the organization's online community. Additionally, as followers begin to feel they are a member of an organization's community and that their voices are important, they will be more likely to become a vocal advocate for the organization's cause through sharing posts with their own social circle online.

In relation to RQ4, the most used visual content by education-based nonprofit organizations was photos (51 percent). This was followed by tweets which did not include any form of visual content (22 percent). As 64 percent of these visuals also featured people, it is postulated that nonprofit organizations prefer to use photos over other visuals in order to capture the attention of their followers. Online users are more likely to relate to and engage with posts that feature people rather than graphics or text that display numbers and words. The newest trend in imagery, GIFs, which re-emerged in popularity around 2009 (Buck, 2012), were the least used (two percent). Whether or not this is due to the fact that the trend is still relatively new, may be fading out of popularity or is simply not favored among education-based nonprofit organizations, is difficult to determine.

In order to address RQ2 and determine which purpose type was most successful in creating vocal advocates for the organizations, the amount of engagement was analyzed in terms of the number of likes, comments and retweets received by each purpose type was collected and compared. Overall informational tweets, which represented 54 percent ($n = 532$) of all tweets included in the sample, received the most

engagement. Informational tweets received 55 percent more comments than community building tweets and seven percent more comments than promotion and mobilization tweets. Additionally, informational tweets received 30 percent more retweets than community building tweets. Informational tweets also received more likes than each of the other purpose-types. Overall, tweets seeking to engage and interact with users through community building messages were the second most frequented purpose type found among this sample. While, promotion and mobilization related tweets overall received 167 comments, 1,271 retweets and 3,684 likes, when divided into its three subcategories, each section received at least 50 percent less engagement than the informational tweets, the message type with highest engaging tweets, in each engagement category. Promotion and mobilization tweets were not only the least used, they also received the least amount of engagement overall in terms of comments, retweets and likes.

These findings support studies from Bortree and Seltzer (2009) which emphasize that organizations customarily use social media for information-sharing purposes. However, contrary to findings by Saxton & Waters (2014) whose research suggests that “more attention needs to be placed on call-to-action messages and other messages that explicitly ask stakeholders to do something for the organization rather than saying something to the organization,” (Saxton & Waters, 2014, p. 294) findings in this study revealed that informational messages are in fact successful in gaining public engagement. Though Saxton and Waters’ research determined that online users prefer dialogue over information, the current research proposes otherwise.

In agreement with the results from a similar study conducted by Guidry (2014), which found that “the most successful engagement stems from communication that asks

questions of social media followers and encourages them to respond to online and offline calls-to-action rather than simply focusing on publicity and information sharing” (p. 256), this study also found this to be true. Findings revealed that while promotion and mobilization-based tweets are the least successful in garnering engagement from users, they are the most successful in creating vocal advocates. Though fundraising and call-to-action messages receive the least amount of user engagement, it is at this level of engagement when organizations are fully engaging their follower base (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). When followers engage with promotion and mobilization messages they, “do not just feel they are making a difference, but start doing something about it, whether it is showing up at an event, signing a petition, or making a donation” (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p.350).

In this case, the messaging type with the lowest level of engagement, in terms of likes, comments and retweets, is the level of messaging which receives the most involvement by active publics. This is due to the fact that the information, community, and promotion-based messages represent a “ladder” of organization and communication function (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). In this sense, “information [serves] as a core activity to attract followers; community-focused messages...engage a following of users; and action-oriented messages...mobilize the audience that has been developed through the first two categories” (Guidry, Waters, & Saxton, 2014, p.245-246). Additionally, as messages ask for more involvement from online users, the less number of people will be willing to get involved with the post. However, the followers that push past this barrier to participation become the strongest advocates for the organization. “Users want information and to be part of the dialogue, but an organization fulfills its mission by

getting its followers to do something for the cause it supports” (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p.350). Though findings from the multivariate test determined that posting one message type over another does not have a significant effect on the amount of engagement received from online users, using several message strategies can still be beneficial to organizations. Through the utilization of informational, community-building and promotion and mobilization messages, organizations can capture the interest of a variety of users and encourage them to either begin their involvement or move up on the ladder of communication and engage further. As a result, using a diverse message strategy can encourage an online community to increase their level of advocacy for an organization.

The aspect of information processing introduced in the situational theory of publics was also used to inform the analysis of this study. Findings exhibited that the use of informational posts by the organizations was valuable in spreading awareness of the organization’s mission, services and events. As suggested in ELM theory, informational tweets elicit users to process later posts with a deeper level of understanding, which can result in a higher involvement rate (Thorson, 1996). Informational messages in posts are a key step needed to drive users from processing tweets peripherally to centrally and encourage them to engage when they encounter other forms of messaging. In agreement with findings by Hallahan (2004) concerning the benefits of organization-public relationships online, through the use of informational posts, the organizations in the study were able to increase public knowledge of their organization while also increasing online engagement with their followers.

Overall, this study found that informational tweets posted by education-based nonprofit organizations garner the most engagement from Twitter users. As a result,

increasing the number of informational tweets posted by nonprofit organizations has the potential to simultaneously increase the level of involvement from online users. As stated by Guidry, Waters & Saxton (2014), “an individual's level of involvement with an organization positions them further into the situational theory of publics classification” (p. 255) Furthermore, a previous study conducted by Bowerman and DeLorme (2014) determined that involvement is an essential element in the process of creating an active public within an organization’s audience. Guidry (2014) concluded that “active publics, those who recognize an issue as being important, have few obstacles preventing their involvement, and [those] who have high levels of involvement, are quick to mobilize and reach out to others” (p. 255). In order to create an environment in which the public will be able to view an organization’s mission as important, it is first essential that the organization shares their beliefs and position related to why their mission is not only important to the organization itself, but also why it should be important to others. Through the use of informational tweets, this component can be implemented. Informational tweets can also be used as the stepping stone for organizations to encourage their followers to continue up the communication ladder and engage with community-building and promotion and mobilization tweets as well.

Twitter provides an environment that allows active publics to convert to vocal advocates on behalf of an organization. This conversion creates the opportunity for organizations “to spread [their] message about an issue throughout an interpersonal network while tapping into perceptions of vetted message credibility” (Guidry et al., 2014, p. 255). As mentioned by Guidry (2014), “The credibility and trust gained through the interpersonal networks of the vocal advocates enhances the organizational messaging

and ultimately creates more engagement for the organization” (p. 255). Through the situational theory of publics, active publics can turn into vocal advocates for an organization’s cause to increase the influence of the organization by having their information and messages shared to the personal networks of the vocal advocates who are trusted by their followed community. As a result, the personal networks of the vocal advocates will be more receptive of messages which originated from the organization.

The current study found that information related tweets create the most engagement from users. Communication practitioners should increase their usage of this type of messaging to increase their effectiveness in producing content that users are willing to become vocal advocates for through post sharing and supporting the organization’s cause. However, it is also equally as important for organizations to continue posting community-based and promotion and mobilization messages in order to encourage users to move up the communication ladder and fully engage with followers at every level of involvement online. Though community-based and promotion and mobilization messages receive less involvement from followers, the users who are engaging with these posts are the strongest vocal advocates for organizations. While this study found that a certain type of organization-public related Twitter messaging produced engagement outcomes for several large and highly followed education-based nonprofit organizations, it is essential that other organizations come to understand how their own audiences respond to these social media components. By evaluating their current strategies on social media platforms such as Twitter, organizations can determine which forms of communication are most engaging to their followers and mobilize the community to support their cause and extend their reach.

CHAPTER FIVE

Limitations and Conclusion

Limitations

The primary limitations uncovered during the research process were in relation to retweets. When posts on Twitter are retweeted the date that appears on the secondary user's feed as the date of the post is not the date that the tweet was retweeted, but the date that the original user posted the tweet. As a result, when gathering data, it is difficult to determine the exact date when a tweet was retweeted. This could affect data relating to how often an organization posts or retweets on Twitter. Furthermore, the likes, comments and number of retweets associated with these retweeted posts include not only those gained from each time the post was retweeted but also those gained from the original post. This complicates the data as the engagement associated with these posts includes more than just the community of the organization which retweeted the tweet.

Another concern associated with retweets was with how retweets should be coded in regard to source when an organization retweeted one of their own tweets. In the current study, these tweets were coded as retweets from education-based organizations. This was done primarily to maintain the integrity of tweets which did originate from the organizations being analyzed in this study. However, as self-retweets were not included in the tweet source category for coding, this created an inconsistency between the number of tweets retweeted by the organizations and the number of retweet sources. Additionally, categories for retweet sources were not exhaustive but rather were created based on

reoccurring categories which emerged as the data was collected. Future research could expand research categories to include media sites, celebrities and other non-education related organizations.

In relation to media coding categories, polls were not included as a classification of tweets. This is due in part to the fact that few education-based nonprofit organizations used this tool on Twitter. In the current study, the purpose of tweets which included a poll were categorized as community building as they promoted interactivity among followers.

As the visual content component groups were not exhaustive, this is another limitation associated with coding categories. Categories did not include any combination of the current selections listed. For example, this study included a category for visuals, which included either people, locations or a graphic but did not include categories for visuals which included all of these elements combined. These combinations were primarily found in videos, which included people along with graphics. These videos were visually coded as containing people rather than graphics as the people appeared more often than the graphic elements.

In reference to the descriptive statistics and multivariate test significance findings exhibited on SPSS, it was posited that the lack of significance could be a result of the high standard deviation. As the dispersion for each of the dependent variables was high, with retweets, likes and comments ranging from 0 to 8,900, this could have had an impact on the findings of the study. In order to test this, the study could be reexamined with only organizations which have a similar number of followers. By eliminating the possibility of comparing organizations with large followings with those with small followings, this could decrease the wide dispersion of likes, comments and retweets seen in this study.

Future studies could be used to further investigate the impact of visual content by conducting an experiment to determine which visual content is most successful in garnering engagement from users. This data also could be used to determine which visual content is most effective in creating vocal advocates. Additionally, this study could be expanded to include all of the top 16 national education-based nonprofit organizations listed on Philanthropedia's ranking. Extending the date range to include posts over the course of a year also would increase the reliability and generalizability of findings. This study could also be expanded to include other social media platforms as well.

Conclusion

This study highlights the importance of understanding organization-public relationships in social media through the purpose of the messages that organizations post on Twitter and how the public responds to them in terms of engagement. By investigating not only how education-based nonprofit organizations are currently using Twitter, but also what types of visuals they include in their tweets and what types of messages they are sending out frequently, their methods can be analyzed to determine if their utilization of social media is positively supporting them in creating vocal advocates for their cause.

Overall, the most frequently used messaging by education-based nonprofit organizations, informational, is also the most successful in garnering engagement from online users. As a result, it was determined that communication practitioners should increase their usage of these types of messages to expand their effectiveness in producing content that users are willing to become vocal advocates for through the sharing of posts and supporting the organization's cause on their own social media accounts. Though informational and community-building tweets receive the most engagement, their level of

advocacy is lower because they require less involvement effort from online users. On the other hand, while there are less online users who engage with promotion and mobilization tweets, these users are the most involved with the organizations because promotion and mobilization posts encourage users to push past barriers to participation in order to fully engage with the organization.

Though posting informational tweets rather than a community-building or promotion and mobilization tweets will not have a significant overall effect on the amount of engagement received by an organization's followers, it is important that they continue to use a variety of message strategies to attract followers at every level of involvement. As nonprofit organizations are faced with limited resources, it is vital that they efficiently utilize the low cost and wide reach of social media to communicate with the public. Social marketing has the potential to become more effective for education-based nonprofit organizations through the use of vocal advocates, who can share these organization's messages with their own personal networks. It is essential that communication practitioners understand how to use Twitter to mobilize their supporters and tap into the reach associated with shared organizational messaging.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Coding Instrument

Analysis of Tweets

1. Coder Name: _____
2. Organization:
 - Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
 - KIPP Foundation
 - Teach for America
 - The New Teacher Project (TNTP)
 - Khan Academy
 - New Teacher Center
 - Green Dot Schools
 - Children's Defense Fund
3. Tweet number: _____
4. Date of Twitter post: _____
5. Type of tweet:
 - Original
 - Retweet
6. Retweet source:
 - Education-based Organization
 - CEO
 - Member of Organization
 - Community
 - Not Applicable
7. Does this post contain visual content?
 - GIF
 - Video
 - Graphic
 - Photo
 - No

8. Which visual content component is displayed in this post?
- Person/people
 - Person/people with Text
 - Event/location
 - Event/location with Text
 - Text Only
 - Illustration
 - Illustration with Text
 - Not Applicable
9. Does this post contain a link?
- Yes
 - No
10. Number of comments on this post: _____
11. Number of times this post was retweeted: _____
12. Number of likes on this post: _____
13. Purpose of tweet/post:
- Informational
 - Community Building
 - Promotion/Mobilization- Events and Promotions
 - Promotion/Mobilization- Fundraising
 - Promotion/Mobilization- Call-to-Action
14. What is the overall tone of the tweet/post?
- Positive
 - Neutral
 - Negative

APPENDIX B

Codebook

Codebook for the Analysis of Tweets

Question 3:

- The tweet number, also known as the tracking number, begins with the first tweet of the month labeled as 1 and continues in sequential order through the rest of the tweets of a particular organization. The first tweet number for the next organization restarts at 1.

Question 5:

- Original- Refers to a post which originated from the organization
- Retweet- Refers to a tweet/post which originated from another user and has been reposted or shared by the organization

Question 6:

- Education-based Organization- Refers to retweets which originated from other education-based organizations
- CEO- Refers to retweets which originated from the organization's CEO
- Member of Organization- Refers to retweets which originated from employees, representatives and/or ambassadors of the organization
- Community- Refers to retweets which originated from another user

Question 7:

- GIF- A graphic image or photo that moves and is usually stopped after a few seconds or continues on an endless loop
- Graphic- Any image which has been graphically designed. For example, this category includes infographics and images which display a text overlay on a digitally designed background.
- Photo- Any photo taken with a camera. Also includes phone and computer screenshots.

Question 8:

- Person/people- Visual content includes image of a real person or people
- Person/people with Text- Visual content includes image of a real person or people with a text overlay
- Event/location- Purpose of visual content is to display a real event or location. These images can include people; however, the focus is on the event rather than the individuals.

- Event/location with Text- Visual content which displays a real event or location and includes a text overlay
- Text Only- Usually a graphic with a solid background that includes text or contains a text overlay
- Illustration- A drawn or digitally created image. These can include but are not limited to: clip art, animals, school supplies, etc.
- Illustration with Text- A drawn or digitally created image that includes text or contains a text overlay
- Not Applicable- refers to tweets without visual content

Question 9:

- Link refers to any re-direction to a website

Question 13:

- Informational- Purpose of tweet/post is to share information about the organization or to serve as a public information post
- Community Building- Purpose of tweet/post is to build relationships, network and/or promote interactivity and dialogue among online users
- Promotion/Mobilization (Events and Promotions)- Purpose of tweet/post is to promote an event or bring attention to a service. For example, sharing a link for a free online tutoring service for students.
- Promotion/Mobilization (Fundraising)- Purpose of tweet/post is to raise funds for the organization and encourage followers to donate
- Promotion/Mobilization (Call-to-Action)- Purpose of tweet/post is to persuade followers to perform a specific act. For example, encouraging followers to volunteer or become members of the organization.

Question 14:

- Positive- Text is received as positive/ has a positive emotion behind it
- Neutral- Text with no emotion behind it
- Negative- Text is received as negative/ has a negative emotion behind it

APPENDIX C

Sample Tweets





Gates Foundation ✓ @gatesfoundation · Oct 5

Quiz time: How many adults (18+) in the United States started college but did not finish?

25% 56 million

23% 26 million

27% 46 million

25% 86 million

1,025 votes • Final results

8 34 46



Teach For America ✓ @TeachForAmerica · Oct 8

Ensuring educational equity demands our nation's most promising leaders—people like you. Apply to join TFA → bit.ly/2fLz5qc



**Educational equity
is the issue that will
shape the course of
our nation.**

5 8

APPENDIX D

Frequency and Descriptive Statistics

Table D.1. *Tweet Origin Frequency*

	Tweet Origin	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	original	662	67.0	67.0	67.0
	retweet	326	33.0	33.0	100.0
	Total	988	100.0	100.0	

Table D.2. *Retweet Source Frequency*

	Retweet Source	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Education-based Organization	71	7.2	7.2	7.2
	CEO	32	3.2	3.2	10.4
	Community	169	17.1	17.1	27.5
	Employee	54	5.5	5.5	33.0
	None	662	67.0	67.0	100.0
	Total	988	100.0	100.0	

Table D.3. *Tweet Message/Purpose Frequency*

	Message/Purpose	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	informational	532	53.8	53.8	53.8
	community-building	243	24.6	24.6	78.4
	promotion/mobilization (events & promotions)	116	11.7	11.7	90.2
	promotion/mobilization (fundraising)	13	1.3	1.3	91.5
	promotion/mobilization (call-to-action)	84	8.5	8.5	100.0
	Total	988	100.0	100.0	

Table D.4. *Type of Visual Frequency*

	Visual	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	GIF	24	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Video	56	5.7	5.7	8.1
	Graphic	184	18.6	18.6	26.7
	Photo	505	51.1	51.1	77.8
	None	219	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	988	100.0	100.0	

Table D.5. *Visual Content Component Frequency*

	Visual Content	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	person/people	372	37.7	37.7	37.7
	person/people w/text	120	12.1	12.1	49.8
	event/place	81	8.2	8.2	58.0
	event/place w/text	1	.1	.1	58.1
	illustration	26	2.6	2.6	60.7
	illustration w/text	92	9.3	9.3	70.0
	text only	77	7.8	7.8	77.8
	none	219	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	988	100.0	100.0	

Table D.6. *Tone Frequency*

	Tone	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	positive	410	41.5	41.5	41.5
	negative	13	1.3	1.3	42.8
	neutral	565	57.2	57.2	100.0
	Total	988	100.0	100.0	

Table D.7. *Use of Link Frequency*

	Link	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	641	64.9	64.9	64.9
	no	347	35.1	35.1	100.0
	Total	988	100.0	100.0	

Table D.8. *Descriptive Statistics Comparing Message Type and Engagement Type*

Engagement	Purpose of the message in the tweet –Collapsed	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Number of retweets posted	1.00	20.2556	97.68699	532
	2.00	21.8642	149.95264	243
	3.00	9.9061	23.94374	213
	Total	18.4200	103.87827	988
Number of comments added by the public	1.00	3.2932	23.53129	532
	2.00	1.8724	5.89545	243
	3.00	.8685	2.84698	213
	Total	2.4211	17.58312	988
Number of times a post was "liked" by the public	1.00	60.0526	469.90178	532
	2.00	54.2675	181.91399	243
	3.00	19.9108	45.15462	213
	Total	49.9757	357.21056	988

APPENDIX E

General Linear Multivariate Test

Table E.1. *Between-Subjects Factors*

	Message/ Purpose	N
Purpose of the message in the tweet –Collapsed	1.00	532
	2.00	243
	3.00	213

Table E.2. *General Linear Multivariate Test*

Effect	Analysis	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.023	7.837 ^b	3.000	983.000	.000	.023
	Wilks' Lambda	.977	7.837 ^b	3.000	983.000	.000	.023
	Hotelling's Trace	.024	7.837 ^b	3.000	983.000	.000	.023
	Roy's Largest Root	.024	7.837 ^b	3.000	983.000	.000	.023
MessageType2	Pillai's Trace	.007	1.167	6.000	1968.000	.321	.004
	Wilks' Lambda	.993	1.167 ^b	6.000	1966.000	.321	.004
	Hotelling's Trace	.007	1.166	6.000	1964.000	.322	.004
	Roy's Largest Root	.005	1.690 ^c	3.000	984.000	.168	.005

a. Design: Intercept + MessageType2

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Table E.3. *Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Number of retweets posted	20114.810 ^a	2	10057.405	.932	.394	.002
	Number of comments added by the public	991.222 ^b	2	495.611	1.605	.201	.003
	Number of times a post was "liked" by the public	251027.972 ^c	2	125513.986	.984	.374	.002
Intercept	Number of retweets posted	253204.759	1	253204.759	23.462	.000	.023
	Number of comments added by the public	3406.216	1	3406.216	11.031	.001	.011
	Number of times a post was "liked" by the public	1685532.471	1	1685532.471	13.209	.000	.013
MessageType2	Number of retweets posted	20114.810	2	10057.405	.932	.394	.002
	Number of comments added by the public	991.222	2	495.611	1.605	.201	.003
	Number of times a post was "liked" by the public	251027.972	2	125513.986	.984	.374	.002
Error	Number of retweets posted	10630301.874	985	10792.185			
	Number of comments added by the public	304155.620	985	308.787			
	Number of times a post was "liked" by the public	125689567.445	985	127603.622			
Total	Number of retweets posted	10985643.000	988				
	Number of comments added by the public	310938.000	988				
	Number of times a post was "liked" by the public	128408196.000	988				
Corrected Total	Number of retweets posted	10650416.683	987				
	Number of comments added by the public	305146.842	987				
	Number of times a post was "liked" by the public	125940595.417	987				

a. R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

b. R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)

c. R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldoory, L., Kim, J., & Tindall, N. (2010). The influence of perceived shared risk in crisis communication: Elaborating the situational theory of publics. *Public Relations Review*, 36(2), 134-140. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.12.002
- Aslam, S. (2018, January 26). Twitter by the Numbers: Stats, Demographics & Fun Facts. Retrieved April 04, 2018, from <https://www.omnicoreagency.com/twitter-statistics/>
- Bennett, R. E. (2011.). What Does It Mean to Be a Nonprofit Educational Measurement Organization in the 21st Century? Retrieved September 4, 2018, from <https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/Nonprofit.pdf>
- Boris, E., & Mosher-Williams, R. (1998). Nonprofit Advocacy Organizations: Assessing the Definitions, Classifications, and Data. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 27(4), 488-506. doi:10.1177/0899764098274006
- Bortree, D. S. (2011). Mediating the power of antecedents in public relationships: A pilot study. *Public Relations Review*, 37(1), 44-49. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.11.002
- Bortree, D.S. & Seltzer, T. (2009), Dialogic strategies and outcomes: an analysis of environmental advocacy groups' Facebook profiles, *Public Relations Review*, 35(3), 317-319.
- Bowerman, K. & DeLorme, D.E. (2014). Boaters' perceptions of a mobile app for a marine conservation social marketing campaign, *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 20(1), 47-65.
- Boyington, B. (2017, May 17). Map: See High School Graduation Rates by State. Retrieved September 19, 2017, from <https://www.usnews.com/high-schools/best-high-schools/articles/2017-05-17/map-see-high-school-graduation-rates-by-state>
- Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (1997). Toward a Concept and Theory of Organization-Public Relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 9(2), 83-98. doi:10.1207/s1532754xjpr0902_01
- Bruce, P., & Shelley, R. (2010). Assessing stakeholder engagement. *Communication Journal of New Zealand*, 11(2), 30-48.

- Cyr, D., Head, M., Lim, E., & Stibe, A. (2018). Using the elaboration likelihood model to examine online persuasion through website design. *Information & Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2018.03.009>
- Davis, J. J. (1997). *Advertising Research: Theory and Practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ferguson, M. A. (1984, August). Building theory in public relations: Interorganizational relationships as a public relations paradigm. In *annual conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication*, Gainesville, FL.
- GuideStar (2018). About Us. Retrieved October 20, 2017, from <https://learn.guidestar.org/about-us>
- Grunig, J.E. (1997) A situational theory of publics: conceptual history, recent challenges and new research, in Moss, D., MacManus, T., Vercic, and D. (Eds.), *Public Relations Research: An International Perspective*, (pp.3-38). International Thomson Business Press, London, England.
- Grunig, J.E. (1989) Publics, audiences and market segments: segmentation principles for campaigns, in Salmon, and C.T. (Ed), *Information Campaigns: Balancing Social Values and Social Change* (pp. 199 - 223). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Guidry, J., P.D, Waters, R.,D., & Saxton, G.D. (2014). Moving social marketing beyond personal change to social change. *Journal of Social Marketing*, 4(3), 240-260.
- Guo, C. and Saxton, G.D. (2014) Tweeting social change: how social media are changing nonprofit advocacy, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(1), 57-79.
- Hallahan, K. (2004). Online Public Relations. *The Internet Encyclopedia*. doi:10.1002/047148296x.tie131
- Hamilton, P.K. (1992), Grunig's situational theory: a replication, application, and extension, *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 4(3),12-149.
- Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations. Retrieved April 23, 2018, from http://painepublishing.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Guidelines_Measuring_Relationships.pdf
- Kelleher, T., & Miller, B. M. (2006). Organizational Blogs and the Human Voice: Relational Strategies and Relational Outcomes. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(2), 395-414. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00019.x
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the world wide web. *Public Relations Review*, 24(3), 321-334. doi:10.1016/s0363-8111(99)80143-x

- Kim, J., & Grunig, J. E. (2011). Problem Solving and Communicative Action: A Situational Theory of Problem Solving. *Journal of Communication*, 61(1), 120-149. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01529.x
- Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (1998). Relationship management in public relations: Dimensions of an organization-public relationship. *Public Relations Review*, 24(1), 55-65. doi:10.1016/s0363-8111(98)80020-9
- Lovejoy, K. and Saxton, G.D. (2012) Information, community, and action: how nonprofit organizations use social media, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(3), 337-353.
- Lovejoy, K., Waters, R. D., & Saxton, G. D. (2012, February 09). Engaging stakeholders through Twitter: How nonprofit organizations are getting more out of 140 characters or less. Retrieved September 19, 2017, from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0363811112000082>
- Men, L. R., & Muralidharan, S. (2016). Understanding Social Media Peer Communication and Organization–Public Relationships. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 94(1), 81-101. Retrieved April 14, 2018, from <http://journals.sagepub.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/doi/full/10.1177/1077699016674187>
- Men, L. R., & Tsai, W. S. (2014). Perceptual, Attitudinal, and Behavioral Outcomes of Organization–Public Engagement on Corporate Social Networking Sites. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 26(5), 417-435. doi:10.1080/1062726x.2014.951047
- Messner, M., Jin, Y., Medina-Messner, V., Meganck, S., Quarforth, S. and Norton, S. (2013) 140 characters for better health: an exploration of the Twitter engagement of leading nonprofit organizations, in Al-Deen, H.S.N., Hendricks, and J.A. (Eds.), *Social Media and Strategic Communications* (pp. 119 - 136). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Nilsen, M. (n.d.). National Philanthropy Day Official Website. Retrieved August 29, 2018, from <http://www.afpnet.org/content.cfm?ItemNumber=4032>
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1979). Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(10), 1915-1926. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.10.1915>
- Philanthropedia. (2009). Ranked Nonprofits: National Education 2014. Retrieved from <https://www.myphilanthropedia.org/top-nonprofits/national/education/2014>

- Saffer, A. J., Sommerfeldt, E. J., & Taylor, M. (2013). The effects of organizational Twitter interactivity on organization–public relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 39(3), 213-215. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.02.005
- SanJosé-Cabezudo, R., Gutiérrez-Arranz, A. M., & Gutiérrez-Cillán, J. (2009). The Combined Influence of Central and Peripheral Routes in the Online Persuasion Process. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 12(3), 299–308. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2008.0188>
- Saxton, G., & Guo, C. (2013, January 8). Tweeting Social Change: How Social Media are Changing Nonprofit Advocacy. Retrieved September 19, 2017, from http://www.academia.edu/3245466/Tweeting_Social_Change_How_Social_Media_are_Changing_Nonprofit_Advocacy
- Saxton, G.D. and Waters, R.D. (2014) What do stakeholders like on Facebook? Examining public reactions to nonprofit organizations' status updates, *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 26(3), 280-299.
- Saxton, G. D., & Wang, L. (2014). The Social Network Effect: The Determinants of Giving Through Social Media. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(5), 850–868. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764013485159>
- Thorson, E. (1996). Advertising, in *An Integrated Approach to Communication Theory and Research*, M.B. Salwen & D.W. Stacks, eds., Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 211-230.
- Waters, R. D. (2007). Nonprofit organizations' use of the Internet: A content analysis of communication trends on the Internet sites of the organizations on the Philanthropy 400. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 18, 59–76.
- Waters, R. D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., & Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 102–106.
- Waters, R. D., & Jamal, J. Y. (2011). Tweet, tweet, tweet: A content analysis of nonprofit organizations' Twitter updates. *Public Relations Review*, 37(3), 321-324. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.03.002
- Xifra, J., & Grau, F. (2010). Nanoblogging PR: The discourse on public relations in Twitter. *Public Relations Review*, 36(2), 171-174. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.02.005