STARS

2017

Social Media and Stakeholders' Relationship in Nonprofit Organizations

Wanzhu Shi
University of Central Florida

SOCIAL MEDIA AND STAKEHOLDERS' RELATIONSHIP IN NONPROFIT
ORGANIZATIONS

by

WANZHU SHI
B.S. Shanghai Normal University, 2009
M.P.A. Southeast Missouri State University, 2011

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Doctoral Program in Public Affairs
in the College of Health and Public Affairs
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2017

Major Professor: Thomas A. Bryer

ABSTRACT

Social media tools, as the advanced technology, have penetrated into nonprofit management field prevalently. Nonprofit organizations adopt social media tools, such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Pinterest for attracting potential supporters, raising advocacy, and running fundraising campaigns. Social media tools break the limitation of time and space through the Internet. They change the way of how people communicate and interact with each other. The philanthropy industry hopes that social media tools could bring them the new opportunities to engage with their stakeholders, such as donors, volunteers, and customers. However, since this technology is still developing, the studies of using social media in nonprofit field are still at the infant stage. Many nonprofit practitioners are confused and questioning the effectiveness of adopting social media for civic engagement. The dissertation aims to examine how to adopt social media advantageously for helping nonprofit organizations to engage with their stakeholders.

Therefore, this study uses a mix of methodology to examine how social media tools could help nonprofit organizations to gain a stronger relationship with their stakeholders. Also, the study explores in more details about the content that nonprofit organizations have sent on their social media platforms. To develop the theoretical framework, this study used social capital and social exchange theory as the guidance. To observe and examine the strategy of using social media in nonprofit organizations, the study is inspired and adopts the social media typology from Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) research and the communication models from

Lewis, Hamel, and Richardson's work (2001). The study proposed that to gain a stronger

relationship with the stakeholders, nonprofit organizations should apply a well-designed

comprehensive strategy with multiple goals on their social media platforms. This strategy

should consider more about the stakeholders' desires and needs and allows the organizations

to communicate with the stakeholders effectively. Also, the study also argues that the content

that an organization presents on its social media would impact on the stakeholders' interaction

greatly.

The study targeted on the art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations in the United

States (n = 195). Data was collected directly from the targeted organization's social media

platforms (Facebook and Twitter). The regression analysis was conducted to investigate what

strategy that nonprofit organization used could gain a high engagement from their

stakeholders. A content analysis was also conducted to explore what posts and tweets could

influence how stakeholders react.

The results indicate that most nonprofit organizations realize the importance of adopting

social media, but a few of them still have not embraced the benefits of the technology

essentially. Comparing with the activities on Twitter, both nonprofit organizations and their

stakeholders were more active on Facebook. On social media, the primary goal for most

nonprofit organizations was to disseminate the information. But sending out the information

can be an effective strategy. If a nonprofit organization could combine their

values/missions/programs with the hot spot on social media, it can promote the stakeholders'

engagement greatly. Building a dialogic content on the organization's social media is still overlooked. But no evidence in this study shown that initiating a dialog would receive a high engagement from the stakeholders. The results of this study also show that a nonprofit organization delivered the posts or tweets more frequently does not necessarily mean it would receive a higher interactivity from its stakeholders. The organization's size (the annual budget) does not influence how nonprofit organizations used their social media tools to interact with their online stakeholders.

Overall, the study explored how art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations used their Facebook and Twitter to interact with their online stakeholders. The study helps both the researchers and the practitioners to understand the strategies of using social media tools in nonprofit organizations. It also reveals several practical examples to illustrate what kind of social media content could attract or discourage the online stakeholders' engagement. The study is also a good benchmark report for nonprofit practitioners to evaluate their social media usage.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my dissertation committee chairman, Dr. Thomas Bryer, for your continuous support and belief in my Ph.D. study and research. You are a great mentor, professor, and scholar, who always take responsibility seriously with genuine interests and passion toward the development and success of others. I am grateful that you always inspire, encourage, and guide me on this doctoral journey. Without you, I could not come this far and continue to work with my passion in the Public Administration field.

I would also like to thank you for the other members of my committee --- Dr. Qian Hu, Dr. Gregory Saxton, and Dr. Staci Zavattaro --- for their patience, motivation, and immense knowledge. You all provided me a lot of assistance to the development of the theoretical framework, data collection, and data analysis. I appreciate all your tremendous help and advice. Also, I am also grateful for all the members of my cohort, especially Dr. Amanda Terry and Dr. Yinling Lin for all of your encouragement and helps in many ways. With the support from all of you, I never lost sight of the ultimate goal in this program.

Finally, I would give a special thank you to my parents for loving me and supporting me without any conditions. Thank you for always being there for me and believing in me all the time. I would also like to thank you to Ms. Anastasia Diamond for supporting me spiritually throughout writing this dissertation. You are all the best happened in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

<u>Background of Study</u>

Nonprofit organizations, as a social infrastructure of civil society, are to create and facilitate a sense of trust and social inclusion while they are providing public services (Anheier, 2005). From the beginning, nonprofit organizations are rooted in a religious system based on voluntarism, which is independent of governments (Anheier, 2005). Under this construction, all the nonprofit participants, such as board members, staff, clients, and government officials, shall work within a cooperative relationship. Thus, cultivating and strengthening a healthy relationship between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders is primarily important. Traditionally, nonprofit leaders used multiple mechanisms to develop an effective communication between stakeholders and the organization, such as conferences, personal phone calls, or newsletters to exchange the inputs-outputs with stakeholders (Balser&McClusky, 2005).

With the rise of social media, many scholars and practitioners have suggested that this advanced technology could be a new relationship-building tool for nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders (Waters, 2009; Kim & Lee, 2014). The advanced social media, such as Facebook and Twitter, is "built on the ideological and technical foundations of Web 2.0 and that allow the creation and exchange of User Generated Content (Campbell, Lambright, & Wells, 2014; Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010)." Through this online channel, nonprofit organizations could communicate and exchange the information with their audience without

the time and space restrictions. More attractively, social media has the capacity for high

information diffusion and active awareness building with relatively low cost (Hausmann,

2012). Social media is dialogical, which is able to maintain a kind of open-ended

conversation for their users, and conform to the desires and purposes of the users (Christians,

1990). With all these functions, it is believed that social media could help nonprofit sectors to

interact with the stakeholders innovatively (Hackler & Saxton, 2007; Kent & Taylor, 2007).

However, several scholars pointed it out that nonprofit organizations have not taken full

advantages of social media on the Internet (Campbell, Lambright, & Wells, 2014; Kent &

Taylor, 1998; Waters et al., 2009). They revealed a lot of organizations just use social media

to disseminate information rather than to create a two-way communication (Campbell,

Lambright, & Wells, 2014; Kent & Taylor, 1998; Waters & Feneley, 2013). The majority of

the nonprofit sectors use social media for raising awareness, educating the public, and

marketing organizational activities; but not focus on gathering "constituent feedback" for

their stakeholders (Campbell, Lambright, & Wells, 2014; Waters et al., 2009). Waters (2013)

stated that most nonprofit organizations only have a presence on social media, but lack the

interactivity to engage with their stakeholders on this innovative platform. A simple, graphic

web-page with little built-in utility would not help the organizations to cultivate the strong

relationships with their supports and clients (Kanter & Paine, 2012). In addition, Campbell,

Lambright, and Wells (2013) argued that nonprofit organizations lack a well-developed vision

for using social media. These organizations are struggling to define how they can use social

media strategically to achieve their goals and stakeholders' desires.

Although the literature on nonprofit organization use of social media is growing, little knowledge for nonprofit organizations to learn how to adopt social media strategically for stakeholders' relationships development and maintenance. Researchers have brought up that nonprofit organizations need to put more efforts on building two-way communication for civic engagement on social media. But they have not addressed specifically what strategies that practitioners could have on stakeholders' expansion and engagement. Therefore, the research questions in this dissertation are: 1. can social media, as an advanced communication channel, help nonprofit organizations to communicate with their stakeholders effectively? 2. do those nonprofit organizations, which use social media to communicate and interact, have a stronger relationship with their stakeholders? 3. If so, what kind of strategies do they use on social media for the relationship's development and engagement? After all, the innovative technology itself is not a panacea for developing and maintaining a long lasting and active relationship. Rather, it is how the technology is embraced and adopted by nonprofit organizations that influence the cultivation of stakeholders' relationships (Kent & Taylor, 1998).

A well-designed strategy would help nonprofit organizations to set up clear objectives of using different social media tools. Following with the objectives, nonprofit organizations could make plans about how often appear on different social media platforms. The strategy could also guide the nonprofit organizations to send out appropriate online

content to the stakeholders.

This dissertation proposes that to use social media tools effectively of having a stronger stakeholders' relationship, nonprofit organizations could design an applicable strategy as a guide. Based on different organization's missions, the strategies of using social media tools could be varied. Some organizations may choose to use social media primarily as the information dissemination tool. Some decide to emphasize on communicating with stakeholders more. Some organizations may even have a comprehensive strategy, which interacts with different stakeholders by offering different content on social media tools. By observing 200 art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations' activities on Facebook and Twitter, this study suggests that to build a stronger relationship with the stakeholders, nonprofit organizations need to consider designing a specific strategy approximately, which advise them to communicate with the audience with appropriate content on social media tools.

<u>Statement of study</u>

To apply social media effectively, nonprofit organizations should create explicit strategies. These strategies should guide the organizations to deliver accurate information and facilitate the stakeholder's relationships. This dissertation proposed that for nonprofit organizations, providing accurate information to the public, developing the dialogue to encourage civic participation, and launching in the effective marketing plans for financial

benefits are all important purposes of using social media. These purposes integrate the potential values of social media and the functions of nonprofit organizations. Furthermore, these purposes should also be interrelated to each other. In other words, if nonprofit organization publicizes their information functionally, it will help the organization to cultivate the relationships with the stakeholders; on the other hand, a well-connected bond with the stakeholders could monitor and help nonprofit organization being transparent and accountable on social media.

According to Campbell et al. (2014), social media potentially allows the organizations to shape stronger relationships with key stakeholders. Meanwhile, these relationships accumulate social capital, which helps nonprofit organizations to operate with a shared vision and common mission (Swanson, 2012). This is to say that social capital is embedded on social media, which potentially helps nonprofit organizations construct and reshape the social networks with their stakeholders (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2011). Nonprofit stakeholders are "people or organizations that have a real, assumed, or imagined stake in the organization, its performance, and sustainability "(Anheier, 2005, p. 227). Saxton and Benson (2005) thought that "the origins and operations of nonprofit organizations are aligned with social capital…without it, nonprofit organizations cannot be effective in achieving their missions."

Comparing with other types of sectors, developing strong stakeholder relationships with adequate social capital is primarily important to nonprofit sectors. Nonprofit organizations

often deal with more pressure on interacting and recurring multiple stakeholders in a complex environment (Knox & Gruar, 2007; Tschirhart, 1996; Van Til, 1994). According to Balser and McClusky (2005), although stakeholders could provide the necessary resources and legitimacy to nonprofit organizations, these streams are not always predictable or controllable. This is because nonprofit stakeholders usually play multiple roles comparing within the private sectors. In private sectors, the "bottom line" refers to a firm's profit; however, in nonprofit organizations, there is no such a clear "bottom line" (Anheier, 2005, p. 227). A nonprofit organization has several responsibilities and missions that there is no price mechanism to accumulate and exchange the interests of its volunteers, donors, board members, or other stakeholders (Anheier, 2005). Because of the plurality of nonprofit objectives, there is a growing need for targeting on key stakeholders so that nonprofit organizations could identify the stakeholders' primary expectations, conflict of interests, and potential abilities to support.

Nonprofit leaders must find an alternative way, other than using price, to monitor, communicate, and manage their stakeholders, in order to acquire human, financial, and other types of capitals. A healthy and consistent relationship with the stakeholders will help the organizations to obtain the resources and achieve the goals. To do so, nonprofit organizations must understand and respect their stakeholders' expectations and desires. Waters (2013) demonstrates that nonprofit organizations should put extra effort on letting their stakeholders realize their importance; the organization care and respect their stakeholders' opinions and

appreciate their participation and support. Social media could be a creative channel for

nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders to exchange information and resources by

purposeful communication. This dissertation proposes that social media is useful for

nonprofit organizations to collect social capitals by disseminating accurate and expected

information; In addition, this exchanging process on social media will positively affect on

stakeholder's relationship, when nonprofit organizations adopt a strategic plan.

<u>Definition of Terms</u>

Social media

Since the Internet is invented in the 1990s, there are numerous Web technologies, such

as websites, blogs, emails, Facebook, Twitter, and so on. Comparing with the traditional mass

media, social media came along the Web 2.0, which allow user participation and user-

generated content (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Saxton & Wang, 2013; Tredinnick, 2006). On

this new platform, every individual can participate in with his/her opinions, knowledge, and

experience as a producer (Lietsala & Sirkkunen, 2008). Wikipedia could be a typical example

to show how content is created and published by multiple online users' contribution and

interaction.

Social media is unique because it provides a high degree of user involvement and

interactivity, which allows users not only create and share information but also communicate

and connect with others (Saxton & Wang, 2013). In this dissertation, it will discuss both of

these two major functions are important for nonprofit organizations to foster stakeholder

relationship. But more focuses will be put on building a marketing communication strategy

for nonprofit practitioners on social media. This marketing communication strategy tends to

let nonprofits to put more efforts on a diverse and specified array of stakeholder perceptions,

attitudes, and preferences. Furthermore, this study will argue that social media is effective in

gaining a strong stakeholder's relationship because organizations will aggregate social

capitals by using this marketing communication strategy with their online stakeholders.

Social capital

To illustrate that the relationship between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders

will be improved by using social media strategically, the social capital theory will be applied.

Social capital is defined as "the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an

individual or group by virtue of possessing mutual acquaintance and recognition" (Bourdieu

& Wacquant, 1992, p.119). The theory implies that social capital can influence the network

building, which improves cooperation, trust, and resource exchange in charitable activities

(Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998). All of those constructs require a relational focus, which bond people

together for shared meanings and common values (King, 2004). Therefore, social capital

plays an important role in gaining and maintaining stakeholders' support for nonprofit

organizations. In this study, it argues that through social media, nonprofit organizations and

their stakeholders could build favorable relationships, which help both parties to collect and

exchange social capitals for achieving the shared goals.

Social Exchange Theory

Besides social capital theory, to explain how the organization-individuals' relationship should be flourished, social exchange theory would be applied in the study as well. Researchers have used this theory to study the development and utility of social capital in organizational networks (Monge & Contractor, 2003). For instance, trust, which is one of the important components of social capital, has been exchanged while two individuals were trying to build a relationship (Burt & Knez, 1995, p.69; Monge & Contractor, 2003). According to Grunig and Hunt (1984), among individuals' relationships, a two-way symmetrical model is the most desirable, which can guarantee an equal chance for participants to exchange the information and build the social capitals. In a two-way symmetrical model, a dialogue could be built between the organization and its public. This dialogue could form "an attitude toward each other held by the participants in a communication transaction" (Johannesen, 1971, p.58). For nonprofit organizations, the most important thing is to show the openness and respect to their stakeholders in the communication transaction on social media. By returns, nonprofit organizations expect the faith and support from the stakeholders for the shared interests and vision.

Significance of Study

Although social media is a relatively new topic in nonprofit field, many researchers

indicate that this advanced technology is the future for nonprofit management since the number of social media users keeps growing (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Lutz, Hoffmann, & Mechel, 2014; Saxton, 2001; Waters et al., 2009). Moreover, many scholars found a positive effect on social media use for advocacy and civic engagement in the nonprofit field (Evans-Cowley & Hollander, 2010; Jennings & Zeitner, 2003; Lutz, Hoffmann, & Mechel, 2014). While the literature on the nonprofit organization's use of social media is raising, the practitioners still know little about how to adopt social media strategically, specially for stakeholders' relationship cultivation. They question about how much time, human resources, and other types of investments to allocate in the strategy of using social media for stakeholder engagement.

In this study, it tries to help nonprofit practitioners to understand what the important objectives should be included in the strategy of social media usage. The results of this study tend to help both the researchers and practitioners to evaluate how social media is effective for stakeholder relationships engagement.

To answer the research questions, the study will use a mixed methodology to investigate how nonprofit organizations use social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter, to communicate with their online stakeholders. The study collects the data from the selected nonprofit organizations' social media platforms and conducts the content analysis to examine what strategy and kind of social media content could help nonprofit organizations to gain a stronger stakeholders' relationship.

Although many scholars have concluded that nonprofit organizations should focus more on relationship development and engagement, they did not put enough emphasis on integrating nonprofit organization's special attributes into the discussion (Lutz, Hoffmann, & Mechel, 2014; Waters, 2009; Saxton & Guo, 2012). In this study, it considers the organization's mission as a special attribute, which could possibly impact on their usage of social media with the stakeholders. Therefore, this study selects the art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations to study with. In a comparison to other nonprofit organizations, the art/culture/humanities ones put more effort on the marketing strategies (Massarsky & Beinhacker, 2002). Clark, Maxwell, and Anestaki (2015) also argued that art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations dependent more on private donations and communities other than the government grants. This suggests that this type of nonprofit organizations need to develop a stronger stakeholders' relationship. The advanced social media tools could bring them the new opportunities. Pervious studies have not put enough attention on art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations. Therefore this study provides a new perspective of how those nonprofit organizations depending more on commercial activities adopt their social media tools to interact with their stakeholders.

Overall, this study is trying to draw a roadmap for the strategy of relationship development on social media in nonprofit organizations. It helps the researchers and practitioners to take a close at what the daily activities that nonprofit organizations have on their social media platforms and how these activities could affect on the stakeholders'

engagement positively and negatively. The results of this study are trying to guide nonprofit

organizations to develop a better strategy of using their social media tools for cultivating a

stronger stakeholders' relationship. The results also tend to challenge and encourage more

research studying on how to use social media strategically in the philanthropic industry.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Nonprofit organizations play a critical role in the development and strengthening of democracy and civil society around the world (Nonprofit Academic Centers Council, 2014). Unlike the private sector, nonprofit organizations have a mandate to use their resources in the exclusive pursuit of their social services mission (Tschirhart & Bielefeld, 2012). There is little doubt that exploring and gathering substantial resources are one of the most important goals for nonprofit organizations. Throughout history, these organizations have been developed and supported by various types of stakeholders providing necessary capital and other resources (Balser & McClusky, 2005). However, competition for donations to an ever-increasing number of organizations has made the nonprofit sector more unstable than ever (Bielefeld, 1992; Luther, 2005; Steinberg, 2003). Therefore, it is critical for nonprofit leaders to find an effective way to develop and maintain relationships with stakeholders to ensure a reliable resource flow.

Enabling advanced social media utilization opens an exciting door for nonprofit practitioners to interact with their stakeholders. Compared with traditional channels, social media provides a potentially synchronous communication, which ensures that stakeholders interact with the organization more frequently and accurately.

In the next section, the study will define social media and identify the different types available. Next, the study will review the usage of social media in the nonprofit field, identify the gap in the literature and finally review the challenges nonprofit organizations face

adopting an advanced social media infrastructure. This study adopts social capital and social

exchange theories in arguing that when developing a comprehensive and flexible strategy for

using social media, nonprofit organizations should implement tactics specific to the

organization's unique internal values and pay attention to what their stakeholders' needs.

Nonprofit organizations could develop a long lasting relationship with their online

stakeholders if they listen to what the stakeholders want and could offer to the organizations

on the social media platforms. This study also embraces both the Lovejoy and Saxton's

typology (1978) and Lewis, Hamel, & Richardson's (2001) six models of communication

strategies with stakeholders to discuss how nonprofit managers should formulate their social

media strategies along with their missions and programs. The study believes that if nonprofit

organizations can communicate with their stakeholders effectively on social media, it will

help to better exchange greater social capital and resources with their stakeholders.

<u>Definition of Social Media</u>

Although Chapter 1 briefly touched upon the definition of social media, this section

clarifies what types of social media are going to be discussed in this study. In scientific

literature, Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) first defined "social media is a group of Internet-based

applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and that

allow the creation and exchange of User Generated Content." Tim O'Reilly, who is widely

credited with the term Web 2.0, suggests, "Web 2.0 applications are those that make the most

of the intrinsic advantages of the World Wide Web: delivering software as a continually

updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from

multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their own data and services in a

form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an 'architecture of

participation,' and going beyond the page metaphor of Web 1.0 to deliver rich user

experiences"(O'Reilly, 2005). In fact, when the World Wide Web was founded, it had already

been designed as a social platform to help people work together (Berners-Lee, 2008).

This new generation of the World Wide Web dramatically changed the public-

organization's relationship. In the past, organizations were the dominant player, taking action

and disseminating information to the public regardless of their actual needs and desires.

However, the information and communication technologies result in major changes

throughout people's lives (Firestone & Bollier, 2006). Scholars began to suggest a "pull"

model of engaging with the public instead of the "push" strategy illustrated above. Kent and

Taylor (1998) noticed that organizations had more opportunities to give the public the first

response as they need. Furthermore, through the particular social media's characteristics,

organizations and the public could establish a dialogic communication and negotiate

relationships in the online network.

One of the unique features of social media is that it is developed based upon a person's

social network. In social media, people create an online profile that replicates their off-line

connections in an online world; meanwhile, they can also expand their network via the

internet (Mergel, 2012). Whether people connect with old friends or meet new ones, all the

social interactions are in real time across the various platforms. People are able to share

details about the places they have visited, the news they have read, and the common interests

while maintaining trusted relationships with their social networks on the internet. Without

this interaction within the social networks, the online platform would be empty and provide

little outside benefit.

Another benefit of social media is that people do not just share and exchange information

individually. The virtual spaces are designed to encourage users to impose content. This

feature allows people to collaborate and produce new and even unexpected results, which can

positively affect the social relations and well-being of individuals, communities, and society

(Lietsala & Sirkkunen, 2008). Therefore, what should be emphasized on social media is the

nature of the content and the active social roles related to the collaboration and participation,

not the technology itself.

This study selects several major social media products currently used in nonprofit

organizations for analysis. Some early online communication channels, such as e-mails,

MSN, Skype, etc., are not included as these channels focus on "one-to-another," rather than

"one-to-many." In other words, they promote the "social" part, but not the "media"

component. This study uses the Lietsala & Sirkkunen (2008) and Spannerworks' genre of

social media (2007) as the basis for the parameters of social media tool classification.

According to the social media genre, there are six major categories: content creation and

publishing tools (such as blogs, wikis, and Twitter), content sharing (Flickr, YouTube,

Pinterest, and Instagram), social network sites (LinkedIn, Facebook, and Google Plus),

collaborative productions (Wikipedia, online forums), virtual worlds (Second Life, Habbo

Hotel, and World of Warcraft), and add-ons (Yelp, Tripadvisor, and GoogleMaps).

Table 1: The Genres of Social Media and Their Activity Types

Genre	Main Practices	Examples
Content creation and publishing tools	Production, publishing, dissemination	Blogs, wikis, Twitter
Content sharing	Sharing all kinds of content with peers	Flickr, YouTube, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook
Social networks	Keeping up the old and building new social networks, self-promotion, etc.	LinkedIn, Facebook, Google+
Collaborative productions	Participation in collective build productions	Wikipedia, online forums
Virtual Worlds	Play, experience and live in virtual environments	Second Life, Habbo Hotel, World of Warcraft
Add-ons	Adoption of practices from one site to another. Transforms a service into a feature of another site or adds new use-value to the existing communities and social media sites through third party applications.	Yelp, Tripadvisor, GoogleMap

Source: Lietsala, K. & Sirkkunen, E., (2008) Social media. Introduction to the tools and processes of participatory economy, chapter 3, "Talking about social media," Table 1. Some (preliminary) genres of social media and their activity types. p.26

Since this study focuses on examining how social media could benefit nonprofit-stakeholder relationship development, appropriate types of social media will be analyzed. Some social media, like Second Life or World of Warcraft, are used for gaming purposes only, which is not applicable to this research. Therefore, the analysis in this study will focus on the first three social media genres: content creation and publishing tools, content sharing sites and social network sites. The study selected Facebook and Twitter as the represents of these social media genres.

Stakeholder Relationships

The concept of stakeholders has appeared in the organizational literature since the 1960s (Lewis, Hamel, &Richardson, 2001). Ansoff (1965) suggested that organization leaders must serve the role of boundary spanners and interact with their constituents to ensure the organization's stability and development. Jones (1980) thought a stakeholder should go beyond ownership, but any entity, which has a corporate social responsibility to the firm. Cornell and Shapiro (1987) described stakeholders as contractors or participants in exchange relationships (Mitchell et al., 1997). Consistent with this thought, Alkhafaji (1989, p.36) defines stakeholders as "groups to whom the corporation is responsible." In time, the definition of stakeholders became broader. For example, Thompson, Wartick, and Smith (1991) suggest stakeholders are any individuals or groups who have a relationship with the organization. Freeman defined stakeholders more specifically as "any group or individual

who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives" (1984, p. 46). In other words, stakeholders could be those owners of the firm; the major providers; the dependents of the firm; or even the people who have a voluntary relationship with the firm, and so on. Similarly stated, stakeholders could be considered as those people who have a "stake" in organization's operation process and outcomes (Lewish et al., 2001).

Developing and maintaining stakeholder relationships are particularly important to nonprofit organizations. The plurality of nonprofit intents and the severity of the social issues could distract stakeholders' attentions causing a potential conflict of interest (Rupp, Kern, &Helmig, 2014). Smith and Friedmann (1994, p.10) identified two critical groups of stakeholders for nonprofit organizations---"those who provide resources as well as those who use the service provided." Along with this general differentiation, many scholars tried to divide nonprofit stakeholders into several other categories. For example, Kotler (1975) tried to divide nonprofit stakeholders into "input publics" such as donors, "internal publics" such as volunteers, and "consuming publics" such as clients. Bruce (1995) classified stakeholders as indirect and direct beneficiaries. Helming and Thaler (2010) grouped it as donors, internal customers, indirect customers and direct customers. Overall, Rupp et al. (2014) concluded that the stakeholders' typology could be categorized into supply-side and demand-side. This study synthesizes the above typology and refines nonprofit stakeholders into four groups: two of them belong to the supply-side: donors and volunteers; and the other two belong to the demand-side: clients and members.

Despite the diversity of the groups of stakeholders, studies suggest robust communication between with each of them is crucial (Heath, 1994; Lewis et al., 2001; MacMillan et al., 2003; Waters et al., 2009). Lewis et al. (2001) pointed out that nonprofits need to be sensitive to issues of stakeholder communication because they always face significant challenges to their existence within a turbulent economic environment. Miller (2009) believed that through advanced social media, nonprofit organizations could nurture their stakeholder's relationships to receive financial support. The interaction with the stakeholders on social media could also help the organizations gain significant non-monetary support, such as supportive word-of mouth intentions, public trust, and a long-term commitment to survive (Waters, 2010). However, developing and maintaining stakeholder relationships are not easy tasks. Researchers have found that inappropriate organizational behavior, whether intentional or accidental, could damage the relationship with stakeholders (Hung, 2002). For instance, many nonprofit practitioners observed that if the organization overwhelms the donors or volunteers by sending irrelevant information, these stakeholders might turn away from the organization. Other scholars found that nonprofit organizations usually overlook the potential benefits gained from two-way dialogic social media (Waters et al., 2009; Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). In Campbell et al.'s study (2014), they interviewed several nonprofit executive directors and found that the most common goal of nonprofit social media utilization was to advocate organizational activities rather than provide an interactive tool to receive stakeholders' participation and feedback. This push-information-

only strategy builds a misconnection between the organization and its stakeholders that block

the stakeholders to participate interactively. Therefore, to establish an innovative and

powerful communication channel to interact with the stakeholders, nonprofit organizations

should invest in developing a well-directed and comprehensive social media strategy for all

stakeholders.

Many scholars now propose that nonprofit organizations embrace a dialogical

communication strategy for social media to negotiate and exchange ideas and feelings with

their stakeholders in a two-way communication approach. Grunig (1989) argued that the two-

way symmetrical communication model has the most advantages. It not only promotes

interactivity between the parties but also requires each party to disseminate equal information

to the other. He also proposed that organizations must establish a structured system with rules

and processes for effectual two-way symmetrical communication. Kent and Taylor (1998)

used the two-way symmetrical communication theory and laid out five principles to facilitate

the organization-public relationships. Afterwards, many scholars applied their dialogic loop

theory to studying stakeholders' relationships in the nonprofit field regardless of the types of

social media. Some studies focused on nonprofit organization's membership communication

and exchange-support on social media (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Kang and Norton, 2003).

Other studies analyzed donors' relationships on nonprofit organization's social media

(Ingenhoff & Koelling, 2009; Shier & Handy, 2012; Smitko, 2012). A few studies discussed

using social media for recruiting volunteers (Briones, Kuch, Liu, & Jin, 2011). These studies

are scattered and partial.

Nonprofit practitioners are still confused about how to develop strategies with clear objectives and targets. Scholars found that many nonprofit organizations lacked a long-term vision. They hesitated to embrace the practicability of the two-way symmetrical communication because of the potential for inappropriate information for target audiences and breaches in client confidentiality (Campbell, et al., 2014). In fact, it is difficult for public organizations to exchange equal information with all types of stakeholders. For example, a nonprofit organization may send out a message about recruiting volunteers on their social media to all stakeholders without regard to their interests or needs. Those stakeholders who are unable or unwilling to volunteer may be overwhelmed by the unconnected message. As a result, these redundant messages could disaffect the organization's stakeholders. Therefore, in order to improve the communication effectiveness on social media, nonprofit organizations could consider to developing a strategy more specific than a strictly two-way symmetrical communication model. The strategy can guide the organization to deliver the appropriate information to the targeted audience effectively. For this purpose, this study first reviews the development of social exchange theory and social capital theory as the basis for the theoretical framework. Social exchange theory will be integrated within the social media typologies from Lovejoy and Saxton's work (2012) and six stakeholder's communication models from Lewis, Hamel, and Richardson's (2001) study to discuss what social media strategy is most effective for nonprofit organizations. Social capital theory will guide the

paper to evaluate the relationship-building process and measure the strength of the

relationship.

<u>Social Capital Theory</u>

Social capital is an important relational and social resource in the voluntary sector.

Existing literature shows the use of building social capital to improve nonprofit

organizational communication, performance, and the decision-making process (Balser &

MaClusky, 2005; Borgatti & Cross, 2003; Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999; Waters, 2009).

Dovey and Onyx (2001, p.152) state "the concept of social capital is complex and proving to

be difficult to define." One potential reason is that different social scientists focus on different

aspects of social capital. For example, business schools put more emphases on using social

capital as a resource of exchange for economic benefits (Baker, 1990). In the public

administration field, scholars believe that social capital theory should be applied to encourage

collaborative relationships for the public good (Portes, 1998; Putnam, 2000). For example,

Fredette and Bradshaw (2012) showed that social capital, as a type of resource, could be

accumulated and exchanged within people's social networks. This idea is consistent with

Bourdieu (1986), who defined social capital as "the sum of the resources, actual or virtual,

that accrue to an individual or group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or

less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (p.119).

Similarly, Coleman defined social capital as "a variety of entities with two elements in

common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain action of actors---whether persons or corporate actors---within the structure" (Coleman, 1988a, p. S98; 1990, p. 302). These definitions imply that social capital theory is highly related to relationship development. In other words, the amount of social capital could be a critical indicator of relationship development.

The social capital theory has been widely applied to studying social networking sites in the nonprofit field (Best & Krueger, 2006; Penard & Poussing, 2010; Saxton & Want, 2013). Franzen (2003) found that individuals who spent more time on the Internet with a higher number of friends usually acquired greater social capital. This is because social capital has an inextricable relationship with an individuals' network relationship development. Individuals build social capital through participation in voluntary activities, and this participation could increase civic engagement (Schneider, 2009). In a social network, actors may have multiple types of relations, such as communication relations, information flows, cooperative relations, trust relations, market transactions, and transaction costs (Monge & Contractor, 2003). Burt (1992) argues that the diversity of an individual's network is a better predictor of their social capital than network size.

However, scholars disagree about whether using social media on the internet could help increase social capital (Wellman, Haase, Witte, & Hampton, 2001). Some scholars believe that advanced social media provides an online community which allows people to share common interests and exchange the knowledge. Through these activities, social capital such

as trust, satisfaction, and commitment, is driving for democratic and collective actions (Schwartz, 1996; Tarrow, 1999; Sproull & Kiesler, 1991). In contrast, other scholars argue that people who spend more time on the internet are less likely to participate in community and philanthropic activities (Kraut, Patterson, Lundmark, Kiesler, Mukophadhyay, &Scherlis, 1998; Nie & Erbring, 2000). They argue that the Internet distracts attention away from offline activities. Simply, when people are on their mobile phones or computers, they pay less attention to their physical and social surroundings (Nie & Erbring, 2000). However, there may be flaws in this point of view. First, scholars, such as Nie and Erbring, focused on whether using the Internet have an impact on collecting social capital. Notice that using the Internet is different than using social media tools. Individuals could have multiple activities while they are on the Internet. For example, they can surf websites, watch videos, play games, or interact with friends. Some of these activities, such as surfing the websites or watching videos, could reduce social interaction and thereby increase solitude (Kraut, Lundmark,et al., 1998; Steiner, 1963). However, some online activities, especially those using social media tools, could increase social interaction between friends and communities. As this study defines social media in the previous section, it is a social platform on the Internet to encourage people to generate their own content while receiving new knowledge and information. Therefore, although individuals and organizations spend time on the Internet using social media tools, they could potentially benefit by acquiring abundant social capital. In addition, some scholars found that online activities should be integrated into daily life.

While not competing directly with offline life, supplemental online activities act as a conduit from which to expand communication channels and social interaction (Flanagan & Metzger, 2001; Wellman et al., 2011). Based on these arguments, it is reasonable to assume that by using social media tools, nonprofit organizations can strengthen stakeholder relationships as social capital is accumulated. Specifically, in this dissertation, it hypothesized that:

H1a: if a nonprofit organization posts more frequently on its Facebook page, it will have a higher interaction rate from its fans.

H1b: if a nonprofit organization posts more frequently on its Twitter, it will have a higher interaction rate from its followers.

The Usage of Social Media in Nonprofits

Recent studies have explored a variety of topics concerning nonprofit organizations using social media, such as raising advocacy (Guo & Saxton, 2013), civic engagement (Gil de Zúñiga, Jung, &Valenzuela, 2012), and stakeholder dialogue (Waters, Burnett, Lamm, & Lucas, 2009). These studies imply a rapidly growing use of social media in the nonprofit field. Many scholars and practitioners believe that nonprofit organizations can strategically and efficiently engage with a larger audience while simultaneously receiving a greater social and financial support by using social media (Flannery, Harries, & Rhine, 2009; Saxton &

Wang, 2013).

The usage of social media for organization-public engagement originated from the development of Web 1.0 technology, which delivered the dialogic and interactive functions through the Internet (Kent & Taylor, 1998; Hackler & Saxton, 2007; Kang & Norton, 2004; Penard &Poussing, 2011). Researchers believe that Web technology provides many opportunities for improving an organization's development, stakeholder relationships, and performance (Kent & Taylor, 1998; Esrock &Leichty, 2000; Kent, Taylor, &White, 2003). Kent and Taylor (1998) concluded that a successful organization's website could offer a dialogic loop, useful information, attract return visitors, offer ease of interface and the rule of conservation of visitors. Kang and Norton (2004) suggest the web can bring a targeted audience together in a relevant channel for the nonprofit organization to deliver messages and advocate public support for a shared-interest.

With Web 2.0, social media now provides nonprofit organizations a more utilitarian interactive engagement tool with the public. The advanced social media tools, such as Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn, have built-in interactivity and are free to nonprofit organizations (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). The recent benchmark study from the Nonprofit Technology Network (2014) shows that social media audiences of nonprofit organizations continue to grow at a faster rate than email and website traffic. The report also shows that Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, LinkenIn, Flicker, and Google+ are the most preferred social media that nonprofit organizations apply for fundraising and advocacy purposes. These trends

indicate that nonprofit practitioners should evaluate and invest on social media for charitable causes strategically.

However, not everyone is optimistic about adopting this new technology for the nonprofit sector. Some studies have found out that many public organizations are uncertain about the ultimate goal of using social media (Campbell, Lambright, & Wells, 2014). Many nonprofit organizations are using social media with a limited view of the technology's potential and actual value (Waters et al., 2009; Campbell et al., 2014). Scholars worry that social media is not effective at bringing new population segments to participate in civic engagement; rather, it may reinforce existing divides, as a passive off-line audience would not engage anyway (Lutz, Hoffmann, & Mechel, 2014). Some scholars also claim that spending time on social media on the Internet will displace people's offline social interactions. For instance, Nie and Erbring (2000) demonstrate that the Internet consumes time away from friends, family, and local communities. With these arguments, nonprofit organizations hesitate to put enough effort into developing a comprehensive communication strategy using social media for stakeholder engagement. Meanwhile, the public is not always fully involved in nonprofit activities, such as fundraising, events, or calls to action (Saxton & Waters, 2014).

Is social media helpful to nonprofit organizations for stakeholder engagement? According to NTEN's 4th Annual Nonprofit Social Network Benchmark Report (2012), nonprofit practitioners indicated that having an effective strategy of using social media is the

key reason for their successes. Based on the literature above, this study argues that social

media tools can benefit nonprofit organizations in cultivating stakeholder relationships only if

the organizations use the advanced tools strategically.

If this advanced technology has unique potential and value, what strategy should

nonprofit organizations use for implementation? Are the nonprofit organization's structure

and function related to the social media strategy necessary in order to best connect with their

stakeholders? Based on the genre of social media and the NTEN benchmark, this study will

use Facebook and Twitter to examine how social media tools might benefit nonprofit

stakeholder relationship development and maintenance.

<u>Social Exchange Theory</u>

If social capital is viewed as a resource for nonprofit organizations, then it may be

exchanged and accumulated via other types of resources, such as financial capital, human

capital, or others (Reddick & Ponomariov, 2012). To accumulate social capital, nonprofit

practitioners should seek to create an effective channel for its collection from the public.

Social media may provide this function as it generates a two-way symmetrical

communication. The idea of two-way symmetrical communication is related to the concept of

social exchange theory. Since Blau (1968) first developed the systematic theory of social

exchange, it has been greatly applied to nonprofit management and stakeholder development

(Cook & Rice, 2006; Drollinger, 2010; Lambe, Wittmann, &Spekman, 2001). Cook and Rice

(2006) point out that social exchange theory is primarily related to voluntary actions that

individuals are motivated by the expectation of being rewarded if they help others first.

Scholars have used this theory to explain how to motivate volunteers to participate in

philanthropy, improve client satisfaction in social services, and encourage donors to give

more support (Drollinger, 2010; Human & Terblanche, 2012; Ohana, Meyer, & Sawton,

2013). For example, Drollinger (2010) argues that voluntary sectors should consider all types

of donations as resources exchange from the donors. To engage with the stakeholders to

encourage mutually beneficial behavior, nonprofit organizations need to understand the

stakeholders' motivations. Furthermore, Drollinger (2010) mentioned that those helping

behaviors are unique in the exchange process as stakeholders usually make tangible donations

but receive intangible rewards (Reddy, 1980). These rewards include an appreciation note

from the organization, a self-image improvement, or the "warm glow of giving." (Andreoni,

1990). Similarly, Human and Terblanche (2012) found out that an exchange process was

more likely to happen between the nonprofit organization and its stakeholders when the

stakeholders received the cause-related message. These stakeholders could gain more

satisfaction by exchanging their resources because the cause-related message will help to

fulfill the stakeholders' individual objectives and needs (Human & Terblanche, 2012;

Varadqrajan & Menon, 1988). Ohana, Meyer, and Swaton (2013) suggest that the link

between stakeholders and the organization is essential in the social exchange process because

it may induce more organizational commitment and cohesiveness. If a nonprofit

organization's clients, donors, and volunteers receive the receptiveness and belongingness, they are more likely to make the commitment and participate with the organization. As these scholars have argued that nonprofit organizations are socially driven by the organization and their stakeholders, social media provides the communicational channels necessary to exchange social capital among all parties (Drollinger, 2010; Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2011; Guo & Saxton, 2013). Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe (2011) suggest that social capital is a valuable resource that can be transferred among individuals and groups' social networks on the Internet. In Ellison et al.'s study, they picked Facebook as an example and argued that if an individual's Facebook page gains more friends, they will have a higher chance to exchange social capital. Guo and Saxton (2014) also found that nonprofit organizations that use social media as a communicational tool might facilitate more social capital with their collective actions than those using social media as an information-dissemination tool. These scholars suggest that nonprofit organizations should put more effort in utilizing the communication functions in social media tools.

Social exchange theory has a long historical development. Homans, Blau, and Emerson are the three pioneers who established the basis of the theory (Blau, 1968; Cook & Rice, 2003; Emerson, 1976; Lawler & Thye, 1999). Blau (1968) emphasized that an exchange behavior is encouraged by returns: "social exchange as here conceived is limited to actions that are contingent on rewarding reactions from others" (Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1976, pg. 336). This exchange behavior is usually involved between two parties in a mutually

contingent and mutually rewarding process; and each party expects this interaction will not

only transact intrinsic and extrinsic rewards but also generate future relations that facilitate

trustworthiness (Roe, 2014). Comparing with Blau's work, Homans (1974) had more

considerations on the exchange behavior. Homans believed that when individuals socialized

with each other, they exchange both tangible and intangible interactions. These interactions

could be either beneficial or harmful to the individuals. Homans brought the idea of "the

degree of reward." He disagreed with Blau that people would always react to the rewards

during the exchange process. Instead, Homans proposed that people only repeated the

exchange process when they evaluated the rewards outweigh the costs (Cook & Rice, 2006;

Emerson, 1976; Roe, 2014).

Emerson reviewed both Blau and Homans' critical work and combined their core ideas

about social exchange theory. He explained that during the exchange relationship, each party

would use their own power to negotiate for the valued resources desired (Emerson, 1976;

Monge & Contractor, 2003). Scholars later interpreted the "power" as "influence" (Cook &

Rice, 2006; Roe, 2014). People start the exchange process by influencing or implying there is

reciprocity between each other. As the exchange channel has been established, meaningful

social capital such as trust, commitment, and satisfaction would be transferred in this

mutually beneficial relationship (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Molm, Takahashi, &

Peterson, 2000).

Nonprofit organizations, as one end of the exchange process, expect to receive valuable

social capital by strengthening stakeholder relationships. Prior to this, the expectation of a successful exchange process is that stakeholders will also acquire the desired rewards. What organizations are able to offer with social media is the key component in their strategy. Lawler and Thye (1999) thought that emotional feelings could reinforce the exchange process by producing social cohesion (Roe, 2014). As many studies have found, philanthropic stakeholders often seek emotional rewards and salient reputation (Arnett, German, & Hunt, 2003; Serpe & Stryker, 1987). Serpe & Stryker (1987) believed that to start social exchange behaviors that each party should first get to know one another to build trust. For instance, individuals would like to donate more if they realize that their contributions are fundamental to helping the nonprofit organizations' clients. Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) suggest that philanthropic stakeholders are unique. Their motivations in the exchange process with nonprofit organizations are usually driven by noneconomic benefits such as feeling good or pride. Arnett et al. (2003) argued that nonprofit organizations should let their stakeholders be identified for their important roles as collaborates, and should help in creating the common values for the organization. Arnett et al. (2003) also suggested that in order to maintain a sustainable exchange process, nonprofit organizations should communicate with their stakeholders effectively by understanding the stakeholders' identity salience and desires first. Donors, volunteers, and clients appreciate it when their special roles and contributions are recognized and approved by the nonprofit organization. The appreciation will furthermore help to improve the stakeholders' satisfaction and trust level with the organization. In the end,

nonprofit organizations will need to nurture commitment for future support and engagement (Shier & Handy, 2012).

One critical component to ensuring a meaningful exchange process is the effective communication. Through this communication, parties may express and negotiate their expected resources (Kramer, 2005; Roloff, 1981). Concerning how nonprofit organizations communicate with their stakeholders, what channels are they using? How is the negotiation delivered? Does the organization target a specific audience or disseminate a general message to the public? The different types of communication methods could influence the exchanged resources between the two parties. Currently, many scholars focus on the discussion of implementing a two-way symmetric communication model for stakeholders' engagement in the nonprofit field (Campbell et al., 2014; Guo & Saxton, 2013; Saxton & Wang, 2013; Waters et al., 2009). Although these scholars recognize that advanced social media tools have the capacity of holding two-way communication, few of the studies investigate specific strategies of using social media to strengthen stakeholder relationships, especially strategies that encourage stakeholders to exchange more resources using the two-way communication process on social media. Therefore, this study not only considers the social media topologies which are developed by Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) but also modified them by using the six communication models from Lewis, Hamel and Richardson's work to observe and discuss the strategies of using social media. Compared with the classic two-way symmetric communication method, the six models add in a more diverse communication pattern

between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders on social media. By examining the different patterns of using social media tools, this dissertation aims to explore an effective communication strategy allowing nonprofit organizations to strengthen stakeholder relationships.

<div align="center">Communication Models on Social Networking Sites</div>

Social media has the built-in interactivity. One important interaction is having the communication between the organizations and the stakeholders. Lewis and his colleagues (2001) developed their six communication models focusing on the relationship between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders. In the study, they argued that nonprofit organizations have a variety of stakeholders. Learning how to communicate well with each of them is crucial (Heath, 1994). They believe that sharing information widely and wisely with the targeted stakeholders could not only allow them to use the information but also make them feel better about the organization (Eadie, 1997). These feelings could lead to greater social capital, such as trust, satisfaction, and commitment. Mason (1984) also suggested that an effective communication strategy involves targeting messages to different audiences. In his study, he advised nonprofit organizations to recognize two types of distinct stakeholders: donors and clients. Lewis et al. (2001) also mentioned that depending on the targeted audience and purpose, nonprofit organizations should adopt various communication channels. In summary, Lewis et al. (2001) implied that nonprofit organizations should communicate

strategically based on the types of the stakeholders and the channels. These channels include

an assortment of social media, which have been mentioned earlier in this study.

Lewis et al. six communication models are: (1) information dissemination; (2) asking for

participation; (3) quid pro quo; (4) need to know; (5) marketing; (6) reactionary. In this

dissertation, these communication models will inspire to develop the coding scheme for the

content analysis. These models are useful to investigate the primary goal of using social

media for nonprofit organizations.

In the equal dissemination model, nonprofit organizations usually disseminate

information to all of their stakeholders equally. Those that adopt this model as their social

media strategy will deliver their message, news, and ideas on all of their social media

channels to their donors, volunteers, and clients. They usually give their posts on social

media frequently and without a specific targeted audience. Lewis et al. (2001) demonstrated

that nonprofits usually use this model to disseminate organization updates, needs and

activities to make people feel more connected. However, one of the disadvantages of this

strategy is that by providing everyone the same information at the same time, the

organization may not be able to address each stakeholder's real needs and interests. Many

scholars have pointed out that reaching out to new stakeholders by responding to their

specific demands is very important (Crittenden & Crittenden, 1997; McHatton, Bradshaw,

Gallagher, & Reeves, 2011). For example, McHatton et al., (2011) interviewed several

nonprofit organizations and concluded that being responsive to different member needs is one

of the important components of a successful nonprofit management strategy. Furthermore,

McHatton et al. (2011) conducted a survey among nonprofit organization stakeholders and

the respondents suggested that their organizations should use specific and targeted language

to communicate and understand their membership on an individual basis. It would allow each

member a higher level of trust and satisfaction thereby creating more commitment in return.

Another disadvantage of one-way communication is the lack of emphasis on receiving

feedback. In other words, even if the stakeholders request different information on the

organization's social media, it is not capable of making such changes a priority.

The second model, asking for participation, is a strategy that organizations use to expect

their stakeholders could participate back. Lewis et al. (2001) explained that when nonprofit

organizations adopt this model, they usually have already applied to the information

dissemination strategy. Compared with the first model, two-way communication emphasizes

building consensus and cooperation with the organization's stakeholders. This model is

closest to the two-way symmetric communication strategy most scholars have proposed. The

participation model treats the stakeholders as equals and is open to different voices from a

variety of stakeholders. As Johannesen (2008, p.58) has addressed, the core of a dialogic

communication is to "focus on the attitudes toward each other held by the participants in a

communication transaction." Nonprofit practitioners could operate their social media

channels as the interactive process, which offers openness and respect to stakeholders while

expecting social and financial support as a return (Kent & Taylor, 1998). Although the second

model asks for stakeholder participation, it does not target the types of the stakeholders and social media channels strategically. This could reduce its effectiveness with the stakeholders. Organization implementers may receive either unnecessary participation or redundant information without a well-designed strategic plan. If a nonprofit organization asks for a financial donation from a volunteer, for example, they may not get the expected returns back. But generally, when a nonprofit organization applied

Many times, building and managing online communication on social media can be costly. The third communication model, quid pro quo, borrows the idea of cost-effective collaboration from the private sector (Hanson, 1997). Instead of disseminating the information equally to all types of stakeholders, nonprofit practitioners give more attention to stakeholders who have something they are willing to offer (Lewis et al., 2001). Organizations using this model believe that those high-resource-holding stakeholders have their own preference about what kind of information should be exchanged on specific social media (Lewis et al., 2001). The third communication model is more valuable by having a targeted audience in the strategy. This improvement could help the organizations to increase the efficiency of the communication with their stakeholders. However, in some circumstances, nonprofit organizations could miss potential key stakeholders because they have not paid enough attention to other types of potential stakeholders. Many studies show that keeping audiences informed during day-to-day activities and periods of crises, their relationship with the organizations could be strengthened and become to the key stakeholders eventually

(Briones, Kuch, Liu, & Jin, 2011; Saxton & Waters, 2014; Sweetser, Porter, Chung, & Kim, 2008). For example, Briones et al. (2011) did qualitative research on how the American Red Cross adopts social media to build the public relationships. Many participants discussed the importance of on-time correspondence with the public. A high frequency of valuable feedback could help the organization understand their actions' impact on the public. If there are any issues about the organization, the Red Cross employees could address them as quickly as possible by using social media tools strategically. Saxton and Waters (2014) also used Facebook and Twitter as examples to illustrate that a dynamic updating status and numerous interactive actions could engender a stronger and more coherent relationship with the stakeholders. In other words, those casual stakeholders, who are not defined as a priority at first, still have the chance to turn into major contributors later if the organization invests some resources on a different communication strategy on social media.

To overcome an inherent problem in the "quid pro quo model," Lewis et al. (2001) introduced their "need to know" communication model. In this, every stakeholder, including those considered major, causal or even potential stakeholders, could communicate with the organization, as it needs. As many scholars have noted in today's society, the traditional push-information strategy does not connect well with stakeholders; they recommend the organizations consider sending out the information to those who express a desire to know (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Briones et al., 2011; Ingenhoff & Koelling, 2009; Saxton & Waters, 2014). Ingenhoff and Koelling (2009) found that there are various stakeholders who visit a

nonprofit's social media page and that each of them may address or request different issues to

the organization. Those organizations who respond to their stakeholders on an individual

basis could develop a stronger and longer relationship (Ingenhoff & Koelling, 2009). By

analyzing a group of environmental advocacy nonprofit organization Facebook pages,

Bortree and Seltzer (2009) indicated that individuals were more likely to engage in an

interactive action on social media than with static information dissemination. For example,

compared with clicking on a link to an organization's homepage, people tended to respond to

more specific links to information or news on Facebook (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009). In Saxton

and Waters (2014) recent study, the public was found to be more in favor of local community-

building and dialogue messages than general information on social media. This is because

local community-building and dialogue messages are more relevant to the stakeholders' daily

life and environment and therefore allow more knowledgeable participation and engagement

on the organization's social media pages. Using Facebook as an example, a status or message

which promotes interactivity and conversation always attracts more "likes" and "comments"

than the informational message (Saxton & Waters, 2014). Driven by advanced social media,

people can choose when and how to communicate with a nonprofit organization. For

example, if a stakeholder is interested in a nonprofit organization's fundraising activities on

its Facebook page, the organization could post the related information with hashtags

("#fundraising," "#donate," "#fundcampaigns") and use the symbol "@" to connect with the

stakeholder as it demands. One challenge of the "need to know" model is that nonprofit

organizations lose some initiatives during the communication process. Stakeholders, regardless of their educational background, age, or personal experience, always have their own biases and self-interests that will influence their communication behaviors, the willingness of participation, and ability to use the information from nonprofit organizations through social media (Bryer, 2011). If a nonprofit organization does not push the information in front of the stakeholders, especially the potential ones, these people may not have a chance to be involved in the organization closely. In addition, stakeholders do not always have the skills and expertise about what to receive and how to use the information appropriately on social media. Therefore, the "need to know" communication model is not always applicable to the online engagement and relationship development between the stakeholders and the nonprofit organizations.

The fifth communication model is labeled "marketing" in Lewis et al.'s work. This model is more dynamic in that it designs and delivers the marketing messages to the stakeholders. Lewis et al. highlighted that the key to this model is "knowing your audience" (Lewis et al., 2001, p.25). That is consistent with this study's suggestion that nonprofit organizations should create a communication strategy to listen, understand, respond, and ask for feedback to facilitate long-term relationships with stakeholders by using advanced social media. The model requires nonprofits to devote time and energy to research a diverse and specified array of stakeholder perceptions, attitudes, and preferences regarding the organization and social media before disseminating any information. Furthermore, this

process of researching continues so that both the organization and the stakeholders will continue exchanging social benefits mutually. In fact, in today's hyper-competitive market, developing long-term relationships with the stakeholders on an individual basis may be very useful to nonprofit organizations. Many relationship characteristics, such as trust, satisfaction, and commitment, involve in individuals (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Due to the speed of the information and rapidly more convenient technology, each individual has the chance to play multiple roles while interacting with different organizations. People want the organization to recognize their identity and notice their roles in the relationship. The "marketing" strategy integrates the advantages from the third and fourth models and fixes those disadvantages. Therefore, this study suggests that nonprofit organizations should adopt this marketing strategy for using social media tools to strengthen stakeholder relationships.

The last communication model is "reactionary." Nonprofit organizations usually adopt this strategy to deal with crisis management. The communication between the organization and the stakeholders is passive. The organization would not contact the stakeholders unless there is an unexpected situation. Although by using social media, the organization can respond to the public quickly and with the accurate information, this model does not design for long-term relationship engagement. Nonprofit organizations usually make the communication because they feel the pressure from a crisis environment. In contrast to advocating the public's action and support, this communication strategy is applied as a reaction to stakeholders' inquiry and criticism. More often under this situation, the

relationship between the organization and its stakeholders has already been harmed. By using

social media as the communication channel, nonprofit organizations hope they can gain the

forgiveness and trust back from the public so that the relationship will be repaired.

Lewis et al.'s six communication models have been applied in nonprofit-stakeholder

communication and relationship development, especially in change implementation

communication (Lewis, 2007; Mort, Weerawardena, &Williamson, 2007; Shumate &

O'Connor, 2010). Weerawardena and Williamson (2007) mentioned Lewis et al.'s

communication models as a nonprofit branding issue. They argued that it is critical for

nonprofit organizations to monitor and understand different stakeholders' perceptions of the

brand by using different communication strategies. For example, in their study, they thought

that volunteers are a unique type of stakeholders without obligation or remuneration with the

nonprofit organization (Weerawardena & Williamson, 2007). Therefore, in order to make sure

that all the volunteers could accept the organization's brand accurately and in time, the

organization should adopt both the information dissemination and equal participation

communicational strategies. Shummate and O'Connor's (2010) study focuses more on using

effective communicational strategies with the stakeholders to gain a corporative alliance. They

suggested that to nonprofit organizations should adopt a mixed strategy of "need to know,"

"quid pro quo," and "marketing" to communicate with those important stakeholders who have

more resources to attract the strong alliance (Shummate and O'Connor, 2010). Some scholars

have already related the models to discuss choosing appropriate media to interact with different

types of stakeholders (Scott & Timmerman, 2005; Timmerman, 2003).

Considering research regarding developing social media strategies for stakeholder relationship development is still in the initial stage (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2011; Lovejoy et al., 2012; Waters et al., 2009), this study argues that to effectively engage with different stakeholders on different social networking sites, nonprofit organizations should adopt a comprehensive strategy. Using social networking sites to disseminate the information is the basic strategy that organizations want their stakeholders to hear from them about the news, updates, and current status. However, to cultivate a longer and stronger relationship, it requires the organizations to have a higher level interactivity with their stakeholders. Instead of simply applying to the information dissemination strategy, nonprofit organizations can interact with their stakeholders by asking for participation or using marketing strategy on its social networking sites. Different stakeholders, then, would have multi ways to engage with their nonprofit organizations.

H2a: if a nonprofit organization adopts a combination strategy of using information dissemination and asking for participation on its Facebook page, it will have a higher interaction rate from its fans.

H2b: if a nonprofit organization adopts a combination strategy of using information dissemination and asking for participation on its Twitter, it will have a higher interaction rate from its followers.

H3a: if a nonprofit organization adopts a combination strategy of using information dissemination and marketing on its Facebook, it will have a higher interaction rate from its fans.

H3b: if a nonprofit organization adopts a combination strategy of using information dissemination and marketing on its Twitter, it will have a higher interaction rate from its followers.

Social networking sites provide the capacity of an ample way to interact with the users. If some nonprofit organizations have developed some formal plans of using social networking sites, they can adopt an advanced strategy to not only let the stakeholders keep hearing from them, but also motive them to give some inputs into the organizations, come to the events, support the organizations, and make the donations for the philanthropic purpose. Thus, this advanced strategy is a combination strategy including the information dissemination, asking for participation, and marketing strategies on the organizations' social media platforms. By using this strategy with variety types of activities, it is expected that nonprofit organizations could receive a higher engagement rate from their online stakeholders.

H4a: if a nonprofit organization adopts a combination strategy of using information

dissemination, asking for participation, and marketing on its Facebook, it will have a higher interaction rate from its fans.

    H4b: if a nonprofit organization adopts a combination strategy of using information dissemination, asking for participation, and marketing on its Twitter, it will have a higher interaction rate from its followers.

Figure 1: The Theoretical Framework of Social Media and Nonprofit Organizations' Stakeholders' Relationship

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To answer the research questions, this study uses a mixed of quantitative and qualitative research design to investigate how social media tools could help for nonprofit-stakeholders' relationships. The data is collected from the nonprofit organizations' social media pages to identify the strategy of using social media tools in these organizations. The web based social media analytic tool "Quintly" is used for data collection. With the help of the social analytic tool, the study obverses the frequency of the post, the specific content of each post, and also the interaction rate between the organizations and their stakeholders. After the data is collected from Quintly, a content analysis is conducted to study what posts can encourage the highest interaction rate with the stakeholders. A coding scheme is developed based on Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) work. The coding is also inspired and adjusted after reviewing Lewis, Hamel, and Richardson's (2001) communication models.

Methodology Literature Review

Analyzing social media tools in nonprofit organizations is a relatively new topic. Several empirical studies have used different approaches to studying the online dialogic interaction between the organizations and the public. One of the good examples is from Kent and Taylor's (1998) work, which studied with the dialogic capacity of the World Wide Web (WWW) for building organizational-public relationships. Although WWW is relatively static, it has already shown some interactive functions among the users, which are developed more

sophisticated in Web 2.0. Kent and Taylor (1998) highlighted that the WWW offered a two-way symmetrical communication channel between the organizations and the public. Along with this argument, Kent and Taylor (1998) developed five principles for online-relationship development. These principles are the dialogic loop, the usefulness of information, the generation of return visits, the intuitiveness/ease of the interface, and the rule of conservation of visitors.

These principles inspired other scholars to develop studies to measure and evaluate organization-public relationships. For instance, Taylor, Kent, and White (2001) conducted a quantitative content analysis with one hundred environmental organization Web sites to evaluate the dialogic communication between the organizations and the public. In the study, they designed a 32-items measure to evaluate how organizations disseminate the information on their websites; and whether the information contains any dialogic features. Park and Reber (2008) have examined the dialogic features of the Fortune 500 corporations' web sites by using the content analysis. They found out that those organizations using a dialogic strategy gained a stronger relationship with the stakeholders. Ingenhoff and Koelling (2009) also applied Kent and Taylor's (1998) five online-relationship development principles to study with how nonprofit organizations engage with their donors on the official websites.

The literature captured some strategies that organizations could adopt when they are using social internet for stakeholders' engagement. However, most of these studies have examined the usefulness of information, which the organizations have posted on their

websites, such as whether the organizations post their missions and contact information. These measure items did not fully capture the new interactive characters from the advanced social media tools. Using Twitter as an example, the 32-items measure cannot evaluate whether the organization's tweet has been re-tweet by their stakeholders, or whether the organization mentioned any stakeholders in their tweet.

Recently, more literature began to discuss how to measure social media usage in nonprofit organizations. Waters et al. (2009) argued that having a social media profile page is not good enough for nonprofit organizations engaging with their stakeholders. They created a 41-items measure for evaluating the organizational disclosure, information dissemination, and involvement. Guo and Saxton (2014) also conducted a mixed quantitative content analysis and qualitative inductive analysis to capture the unique social media features for nonprofit organizations. In their research, they incorporated the evaluation on both the information dissemination and the communication functions of the social media tools. For example, to examine the dialogic features of the organization's Twitter, Guo and Saxton (2014) observed the number of direct messages, the number of retweets, the number of hyperlinks, the number of hashtags, and the number of mentions. These indicators could help nonprofit leaders to observe the stakeholders' online interactions at the organizational-level (Saxton & Waters, 2014).

Although the recent literature has developed more suitable measurements for evaluating the advanced social media tools, they have not focused on the strategic usage of the tools in

the nonprofit field. The literature from the public relation field have not emphasized much on how to evaluate the strategic management component (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2011; Guo & Saxton, 2014; Saxton & Wang, 2013; Waters et al., 2009). Therefore, in this study, it transforms the measurement of social media usage from the public relation perspective into the public administration perspective.

In addition, those previous studies have conducted the analysis on one type of social networking site (Bortee & Seltzer, 2009; Waters et al., 2009; Guo and Saxton, 2014). Nowadays, it is very common for nonprofit organizations having and managing several social media tools at one time. Different social media tools also carry with unique functions, which may lead the organizations to interact with the stakeholders differently. Therefore, in this study, it examines how nonprofit organizations could gain a stronger stakeholder's relationship by using both Facebook and Twitter.

Research Design

This study uses the cross sectional non-experimental research design. A cross-sectional study involves in the observations cross sections at one point in time (Babbie, 2013). In this study, the research collects the data from the art/culture/humanities nonprofit organization across the nation for a one-month period.

The study conducts a mixed method to explore whether using social media tools could help nonprofit organizations to strength their stakeholders' relationships, and to explain what

strategies that the organization uses could gain a stronger relationship.

The study collects the social media data, such as the frequency and the content of the updates, from the art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations. The social media content, like Facebook's posts and Titter's tweets, could help the researcher to identify and evaluate the types of the strategy that each organization applies to on the online platform. As it has been mentioned in the methodology literature review, the content analysis is widely used for studying with social media usage. This study will use Waters et al. (2009) and Lovejoy & Saxton's (2012) work as a guidance to develop the measurement of identifying the social media strategies.

The research conducts a content analysis of the participated nonprofit organizations' social networking sites (Facebook and Twitter). Content analysis "is the systematization of text analysis…Underlying meanings and ideas are revealed through analyzing patterns in elements of the text, such as words or phrases" (Holsti, 1969; Yang & Miller, 2008, p. 689). It focusses on analyzing the word meanings, which shows its qualitative features (Holsti, 1969). Usually, it requires the researcher created a set of codes to apply to the analysis (Bernard, 2001, p.476). The researcher then can use multiple coders to score each unit of analysis given specific criteria (Bernard, 2001; Holsti, 1969). The reason of using multi-coders is to remove the bias from one researcher's or coder's subjective interpretation during the coding process. As Holsti (1969) stated that "No (human) coder is completely free from bias, but the researcher must take steps to minimize the effects of coder bias on the project. This can be

achieved by having multiple coders." To improve the validity of the content analysis, research shall also check the inter-coder reliability, which refers to an agreement among coders about the interpretation of the content (Ellis, 1994; Craig, 1981).

Following the literature review, many scholars have conducted content analysis or coding procedures following the general rules. For instance, Bryer (2007) applied a similar coding process in the dissertation, "Negotiating Bureaucratic Responsiveness in Collaboration with Citizens: Findings from Action Research in Los Angeles." In this study, the author discussed using multiple coders to adjust and merge the coding scheme to remove the bias from one single coder (or researcher). Although several coders were operating the coding process together, the author herself was still the leading researcher and played in a guding and monitoring role in the whole coding process.

This study followed the literature review discussed above. A coding scheme with nine categories is developed based on Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) work. Four coders were trained for the coding process. I was the leading researcher and facilitated other coders for the coding procedure. The inter-coder agreement and the Cohen's kappa score are checked for the inter-coder reliability.

The content analysis helped to group the organizations into different social media strategies' categories. After the qualitative analysis, the study used the multiple regressions models to predict how the frequency of using social media and the types of the strategy could impact on the interactivity between the organizations and their online stakeholders.

<center>Population and Sample Selection</center>

This dissertation is interested in studying with how nonprofit organizations use social media to interact with their stakeholders. Nonprofit organizations, as the "third sectors," usually cover a variety of public services, such as education, healthcare, community development, environment, and so on (Anheier, 2014). Based on different missions and interests, the Charity Navigator classifies nonprofit organizations into eleven categories. They are animals, art/culture/humanities, community development, education, environment, health, human services, international, human and civil rights, religion, research & public policy.

Because of the variety of nonprofit organizations, each of them may use social media differently. As Kanter and Paine (2012) have discussed that one of the important objectives of social media strategy for nonprofit organizations is to adopt the tools, which are appropriate to the organizations' missions and goals.

According to the Charity navigator, the nonprofit organizations, which support artistic and cultural preserve artistic and cultural heritage, could be classified as the art/culture/humanities nonprofits (Charity Navigator, 2015). These organizations help the civilized artistic and cultural materials from the past and present continue to be accessible, enjoyed, and preserved. The typical art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations could be museums, galleries, historical society.

The art/culture/ humanities nonprofit organization is a very special philanthropic group. In the United State, this type of nonprofit organizations occupied 22% of the nonprofit sector

(Salamon, 2012). Art/culture/humanities organizations tend to depend on donations more than government grants (Andreoni & Payne, 2003; Clark, Maxwell, Anestaki & List, 2011). This type of nonprofit organizations is more likely to pursue the engagement from their stakeholders via social media (Andreoni & Payne, 2003; Clark, Maxwell, & Anestaki; List, 2011). Thus, comparing with other types of nonprofits, they are shifting heavily to the commercial activities (Massarsky & Beinhacker, 2002). According to Massarsky and Beinhacker's (2002) study, 60% of arts and culture organizations operate towards to business pattern. Studies have also found out that due to the government cutbacks and the competitive market, art/culture/humanities organizations put more emphases on adopting marketing strategies from the private sectors (Hansmann, 1986; Hughes & Luksetich, 2004). Using Museums as an example, more and more of them adopt technological innovations to encourage visitors to buy their tickets and products (Vicente, Camarero, & Garrido, 2012).

There is another special reason that why art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations should pay more effort on adopting social media tools for stakeholders' engagement. Art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations could use the advanced social media creatively because these organizations interact with their stakeholders by more visual types of information (pictures and videos). Therefore, in this study, it only focuses on how the art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations adopt social media strategically to gain a stronger relationship with their stakeholders. The study population is all the art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations in the United States.

This study uses the convenience-purposive sampling method. Using this method, each nonprofit organization in the study population will have an equal chance to be selected to study with. The list of the nonprofit organizations is generated from the Charity Navigator. Charity Navigator is one of the nation's largest and utilized evaluator (Charity Navigator, 2015). The organization assesses over 8,000 American charities by different objectives. On the Charity Navigator website, under the category of "arts/culture/humanities,' there are 1035 of them totally.

Previous studies show that having around 100 to 200 organizations to study social media related topic usually yelled an adequate number. For instance, in Saxton & Guo (2014) study of how nonprofit organization using Twitter for advocacy, the sample size is 188. In Waters et al.' work, the team randomly sampled 275 nonprofit organizations to study their Facebook performance. Campbell et al. studied the social media usage in 151 nonprofit organizations. Based on these empirical studies, this study randomly selected 200 nonprofit organizations from Charity Navigator's database under the "art/culture/humanities" category.

Data Collection

In this study, 200 nonprofit organizations are randomly selected from the Charity Navigator's list. From Charity Navigator website, all 1,035 nonprofit organizations, which are under the category, "arts/culture/humanities," have first been put into the database. Then the researcher uses excel to generate a random sample with 200 nonprofit organizations from

the database.

After getting the sample, the researcher uses the social media analytic tool, "Quinty," to collect the social media information from the participated nonprofit organizations. Quintly is founded in March 2014, in San Francisco. It is a web-based analytic tool, which can help to track, sort, and analyze the social media performance. This web-based tool can combine different social media performance, such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Google+, Instagram…all on one dashboard to overview and compare. Some of the features of this tool are 1. It provides a competitive benchmark. It allows the users to track a good amount of organizations' social media platforms at once. 2. This tool tracks the social media data in real time. And it allows the users to customize the specific time period for the tracking process. 3. Quintly also provides a report summarizing all the indicators that the users are interested in. The report could be generated in Excel, Word, or PDF version to review.

Through Quintly, it provides some valuable social media indicators. Using Facebook as an example, the analytic tool could monitor the interactive activities of the nonprofit organization and its stakeholders. The rate is calculated by counting the total number of "likes," "share," and "comments" that the organization receives dividing by the total number of the organization's Facebook followers (see figure 1). Below are some of the important data that this study collected by using "Quintly":

- The interaction rate on social media tools (Facebook and Twitter)

- The number of posts that the organization have on each social media tools per week

● The response rate that the organization gives to their online followers from each

social media tools

Figure 2: The Calculation of the Interaction Rate from the Quintly

One of the most important functions on Quintly is that it can track all the content

information from the organizations' social media pages. For instance, Quintly is able to

collect all the posts from the organization's Facebook pages, and the tweets from their Twitter

account daily. This type of data is useful for the content analysis.

In this study, through the social media analytic tool, "Quintly," it collects 200 nonprofit

organizations' posts from their Facebook pages, and the tweets on their Twitter accounts from

November 1st to November 30th. After the data is collected, four coders have been trained to

help with the content analysis. This analysis helps to determine what type of strategy that the

organization adopts when it interacts with their online stakeholders.

Currently, most public sectors' social media pages are open to the public. Some

information, such as Facebook status, and tweets, contains valuable information that

researchers could analyze with. For example, Hand and Ching (2011) have collected the data

from local governments' Facebook pages to analyze what type of messages that the government communicates with the citizen. Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) collected nonprofit organizations' tweets to study with the organization's communication functions with the stakeholders. In a word, collecting the data from the social media tools, researchers could receive a lot of important information, such as the frequency of using social media, the types of the messages that organization is sending out, or the audience that the organization targets on.

Coding Scheme

In order to conduct the content analysis, this study adopts the coding scheme from Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) work. Previously, there are some studies have developed different kinds of coding for social media content analysis (Java, Finin, Song, &Tseng, 2007; Naaman, Boase, & Lai, 2010). However, most of these codes have only been used to analyze the content from an individual level. For instance, Java, Finin, Song, and Tseng (2007) have found out that most individuals using Twitter for three general categories: being an information source; making friends; and seeking information. In Naaman, Boase, and Lai (2010) work, they developed a coding scheme with 9 categories for individual using social media.

Although individuals and organizations use social media for similar purposes, they still have several differences. For example, for individuals, the primary goal of using social media is not necessary for raising social awareness. In contrast, Waters et al. (2009), Guo and Saxton

(2012) found out that advocating for social goods is one of the most important purposes. The coding schedule that Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) have developed is the first one, which classified social media content by using organizations as the unit of analysis.

Based on the empirical studies, Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) developed a coding scheme with twelves categories to examine the content of nonprofit organizations' tweets and determined what the primary communicative goal they serve. Lovejoy and Saxton thought that generally there are three major purposes of using social media in nonprofit organizations--- information sharing, community building, and asking the stakeholders to make an action. Therefore, the twelves categories from the coding scheme have been assigned to these three big functions. There is only one category of the "information" function, which shows organizations disseminate the "me now" type of content on their social media. In "community" function, the categories are "giving recognition and thanks," "acknowledgement of current & local events," "responses to reply messages," "response solicitation." Lastly, in "action" function, there are "promoting an event," "donation appeal," "selling a product," "call for volunteers & employees," and "lobbying and advocacy," "join another site or vote for the organization," and "learn how to help." By analyzing 2,437 tweets between November 8tn and December 7th, 2009 from 73 organizations Twitter accounts, Lovejoy and Saxton (2012") have found out that 58.6% of the tweets fell under the "information" function; 25.8% fell under the "community" function; and only 15.6% were under the "action" function. A summary table is shown as below:

Table 2: Tweet Functions

Category	Freq.	(%)
Information (58.6%) Information	1,429	58.6
Community (25.8) Giving recognition and thanks	321	13.2
Acknowledgement of current & local events	9	0.4
Responses to reply messages	199	8.2
Response solicitation	99	4.1
Action (15.6%) Promoting an event	190	7.8
Donation appeal	75	3.1
Selling a product	12	0.5
Call for volunteers & employees	20	0.8
Lobbying and advocacy	14	0.6
Join another site or vote for organization	29	1.2
Learn how to help	40	1.6

Source: Lovejoy, K. & Saxton, G. D., (2012). Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 17(3), Table 1. Tweet Functions, page 342

To apply this coding scheme from Lovejoy and Saxton (2012), the coders first reviewed some targeted nonprofit organizations in this study and did a pilot testing for the content analysis. The coders randomly selected 109 tweets from five organizations in the pilot testing.

After that, several adjustments are made for the coding scheme.

First, the findings from Lovejoy and Saxton work shows that several categories, such as "call for volunteers & employees," "lobbing and advocacy," and "selling a product," have relatively low percentage of all the tweets they have collected. Similarly, in the pilot test, coders found out that several categories only have limited or no number of tweets. For instance, among the 109 tweets from the pilot test, there was only 1 tweet can be coded as "call for volunteers & employees." There are no tweets can be identified under the categories "lobbying and advocacy," learn how to help," "response solicitation." These categories with low proportion would not be able to give enough power for the later analysis. Therefore, for this study, the coding scheme does not include these categories.

On the other side, based on the observation of the tweets in this study, some new categories have been added in. For example, for the "information" category, coders found out that nonprofit organizations usually announced the news and activities directly related to themselves, or news/knowledge/information not related to their missions at all. As a result, two categories, "direct information" and "indirect information" have been created under the "information" function.

Because of the change of the categories, the study recognized that nonprofit organizations applied social media with different functions than the ones from Lovejoy and Saxton's work (2012). For instance, in Lovejoy & Saxton's study, they did not specify any type of nonprofit organizations in the sample. However, this study argues that different nonprofit organizations

with different mission and interests may use social media differently. Thus, the study sample focuses on "art/culture/humanities." In this type of nonprofit organizations, there are many museums, theaters, or dancing studios. The coders have found out that they applied marketing strategy heavily on their social media platforms to sell their products, such as tickets, products from their gift shops, or art related goods. Therefore, marketing is one of the major function that art/culture/humanities nonprofits embrace in this study. Considering both Lewis, Hamel, and Richardson's six communication models and Lovejoy and Saxton's work, this study adjusted the major functions of using social media in art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations are: disseminate information, ask for participation, and marketing. A summary table of the functions with the categories and examples is shown as below:

Table 3: Social Media Strategies and Categories

Functions	Categories	Explanation	Examples
Information Dissemination Strategy1	Direct Information about the Organization (Category1)	Organization's post shows the information/knowledge/activities about itself.	Facebook: Here's what's happening at The Lensic This holiday season! Twitter： The #ChristmasCarol set today http://bit.ly/2evnVGf
	Indirect Information about the Organizatio	The organization shows/shares the general knowledge/information (not directly related to the	Facebook: Who can argue with science?

Functions	Categories	Explanation	Examples
	n	organization's current activities/needs	Twitter: "Two men in a row, the X is no mo'"--Chris Child explains how we inherit the X chromosome https://t.co/EoKIpBlSkF #DNA #Genealogy http://bit.ly/2eloLC0
	Greeting Information	The organization only gives greetings on its post	Facebook: Happy Thanksgiving Milwaukee!!! Twitter: May your plates are filled w/ peace & the joy of being w/ loved ones. We are grateful for you! Happy Thanksgiving! https://t.co/Ymkp5zazaV
	Giving recognition and thank you note	In this type of post, it usually mentions who the specific stakeholders are and what they have done to the organization. After the post is published, it is not necessary to expect the stakeholders would reply to.	Facebook: Thank you Walmart Foundation Twitter: Thanks 2 @iggysbakery 4 the warm, tasty treats @ our #OpenRehearsal of #ASPWintersTale this morning! Enjoyed by all! https://t.co/u16DJLyOTH
Participation Strategy2	Dialogue Initiation	This type of the posts usually asks for stakeholders' questions/inputs/thoughts/opinions. It also expects that the stakeholders to reply back as a	Facebook: Question! What album is perfect to you except for that ONE not-so-perfect track? DJ Ken shares his

Functions	Categories	Explanation	Examples
		conversation.	*almost* perfect albums Twitter: Our beautiful tug Delaware. Do you know where she was built and in what year? Post in the comments below, and be... https://t.co/Do71YBGl26
	Promote an event	This type of the posts ask the online stakeholders to join/participate in/attend the organization's events/activities. The post should also be explicit by providing a date, time, or place.	Facebook: All aboard! Join us from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. this Thursday to experience the Evansville Museum in a whole new way. Take a step back in time and ride the rails with "live" train riders from a bygone era. Guests are invited to take selfies, ask questions and take a journey onboard EMTRAC http://bit.ly/2esr35o Twitter: Shop downtown Livermore with @livedowntown & @Bothwell_Arts Nov 21 from 7 am-11 am with the Earlier Than the Bird Art Fair! #bankheadtheater http://bit.ly/2elrJX1
	Asking for vote	The post asks their stakeholders to vote for the organization or something related to the	Facebook: Voting ends THIS SUNDAY!

Functions	Categories	Explanation	Examples
		organization.	Be heard! Vote for your favorite local artists and their music videos, album covers and more: radiomilwaukee.org/rmma 15 http://bit.ly/2f8oKDa Twitter: Vote for @HydeCollection Director, Erin Coe! @GlensFallsSymph #ConductorContest https://t.co/Y3VBYtPqIc
Marketing Strategy3	Selling a product	The post is about selling a product to produce the organization's revenue. The post usually incudes the product name and price.	Facebook: Black Friday? How about a fun, frosty Friday instead? Enjoy a series of free activities at the Lincoln Presidential Library and then take the entire family to the Lincoln museum for just $10. http://bit.ly/2e8tgEx Twitter: Save $2 on advance tickets to see the new Toys exhibit opening March 4, 2016! Buy online: https://t.co/9lQNbLdPV7
	Soliciting the donation	Nonprofit organizations sometimes use social media to solicit the donation. In some	Facebook: Make a gift to the AK for #GivingTuesday on 12/1

Functions	Categories	Explanation	Examples
		cases, the posts are asking for the donation directly; in other cases, the posts would address that part of the sales from the products is donating.	in honor of everything that inspires you" should be coded as "1." http://bit.ly/2eGLlGi Twitter: Artists are the lifeblood of the Flynn. Please consider a year-end gift to Fund an Artist: https://t.co/j02Crd26zO

Coding Procedures

To code this numerous information from the nonprofit organizations' social media content, this research team employed four coders (including the researcher herself) to conduct the content analysis. Coders have two weeks' training first under the supervision of the researcher with the coding scheme. One week concentrated on coding the Facebook posts, and the second week concentrated on coding the Twitter. During the training, a hundred of Facebook posts and Tweets have been randomly picked up to code. Four coders worked separately while they were coding. Then the research gathered the coders together to modify their coding. If coders had questions, misunderstanding, or disagreement, they discussed with the researcher immediately for the clarification. In the end, both coders achieved the agreement on the coding scheme in 100%.

In the study sample, each organization delivered a certain number of Facebook posts and tweets on its social networking sites. The range of the number of posts and tweets among different organizations is wide. In one month, some organizations gave one update on its social media pages; while some active ones gave hundreds of posts. To ensure that all the nonprofit organizations in the sample are relatively comparable if an organization posts more than 50 pieces of posts (or tweets) on Facebook (or on Twitter), the researcher will randomly select 50 posts (or tweets) in the database for the content analysis.

Eventually, there are 5,519 Facebook posts and 5,004 Tweets selected for the final analysis. Four coders spent five months finishing the coding. During these five months, the coders were asked for a weekly update. If there is confusion about the social media content, the coders can stop immediately and ask the clarification from the researcher. After the coding is finished, the research used the Cronbach's alpha to check the internal reliability between the independent coders. Cronbach's alpha is unusually used to estimate two independent tests that measure the same construct (Cortina, 1993). The result showed that the cronbach's alpha that two coders have on Facebook coding is 94.3%, and the number on Twitter coding is 99.3%.

<u>Dependent Variable</u>

Interaction Rate

The dependent variable in this study is the interaction between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders on the social media. Several studies have discussed how to measure the

online relationship between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders. For example, to determine how stakeholders interacted with nonprofit organizations, Waters et al. (2009) conducted a content analysis of 275 nonprofit organizations Facebook profile pages. Specifically, they checked how frequently that the organizations would communicate with the stakeholders on their Facebook wall. These communicative activities include sharing pictures, video, and links; having a discussion on the organization's page; and using the message board. Bortree and Seltzer (2009) also conducted a content analysis research studying on how environmental advocacy groups build the dialogs with their Facebook followers. In the study, they checked the "users' posts (number of user posts on wall and discussion board)" as the key outcome variable to detect how the organizations' dialogic strategy impacted on their Facebook followers.

Besides using the content analysis, some scholars chose to conduct the quantitative research to analyze the organization-stakeholders' relationship on social media. Guo and Saxton (2014) examined the engagement activities between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders by collecting the interactive information from the Twitter. The interactive information includes direct messages, retweets, hyperlinks, hashtags, and user mentions. Guo and Saxton (2014) argued that most social media tools have two dynamic functions: connections and messages. The messages function is more important than the connections. Stakeholders, who simply build the connections on the social media page, may not necessarily make any actions with the nonprofit organization on social media.

In fact, many nonprofit organizations did not realize that evaluating the interactivity from the connected stakeholders on the social media is one of the most important indicators (Campbell, Lambright, &Wells, 2014). Most of the social media nowadays provide the users with the opportunity to interact with others. For example, on the Facebook page, a user could like, comment on, or share the organization's content on its Facebook wall. On Twitter, the user also could interact with the organization by retweet, using hashtaags, or user mentions. Even on the Youtube, users could comment on the videos that the organization updates. Therefore, in this study, the interaction rate from the organization's social media is treated as the dependent variable.

This study mainly focuses on Facebook and Twitter. These two social media operate differently based on their functions. Comparing with Twitter, Facebook has more built-in functions, such as create an event, publish an album, and "on this day." Facebook allows the users give more content since it does not have a 140 letter character limit on its post, which Twitter has this trait since it has been founded. As a result, the online users may interact differently on different social media, and this will impact on the interaction rate with the nonprofit organizations. Users may publish more content on Facebook, but faster and more frequently on Twitter. For this consideration, this study developed two regression models to observe and analyze the interaction rate from Facebook separately from Twitter.

<u>Independent Variables</u>

To detect what factors could impact on the interaction between nonprofit organizations

and their stakeholders on social media, this study considered several independent variables.

Number of posts

To develop a good relationship with the online followers from different social media, it

is advisable to make the content fresh and interesting constantly (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

The abundant updates give the opportunities to the online stakeholders to interact with the

nonprofit organizations.

Many studies have considered that the frequency of the exposure on social media is an

important indicator of the organization's social media's strategy (Bonson, Torres, Royo, &

Flores, 2012; Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Waters et al., 2009). These scholars implied that the

more frequently that an organization posts on its social media platform, the more interactions

happens with the stakeholders. However, some other scholars and practitioners argued that

the constant updates without the relevance could bother the audience, rather than attract them

(Kanter & Paine, 2012; Campbell, Lambright, & Wells, 2014). Kanter and Paine (2012) have

found out that some nonprofit organizations either did not gain the new followers or lost the

connected ones because the organizations kept posting the noise information. Therefore, in

this study, it considers the frequency of posting or tweeting as an important impactor on the

interaction between the organizations and their stakeholders.

To measure this independent variable, this study collected the number of posts/tweets

that the targeted organization updates on its social media tools (Facebook and Twitter) in a

month. On Facebook, the posts include the status, pictures, videos, and shared links. On

Twitter, it includes the original tweets that the organization published. In some cases, there

might be some duplicated posts on different social media platforms. For example, if a

nonprofit organization send the tweet with the same characters, pictures, and link, it will be

considered as a duplicated content in this research. In this case, the coders would remove the

duplicated content and count the repeated posts only once.

Types of the strategy

There are numerous ways of developing and managing strategies in public sectors

(Rainey, 2009). Depending on nonprofit organization's resources, the practitioners may

choose to construct the strategies formally or informally. A good strategy could direct the

organization with a long-term goal, which matches its resources to the organization's primary

missions, changing environment, and the stakeholders' expectations (Courtney, 2002).

Generally, a good strategy should contain the clear and realistic goals, the setting of policies

or rules, and the specific steps to achieve the goals (Quinn, 1980). In addition, a formal

strategy should be well-written and shared within the organization as the guidance.

Sometimes, due to the limited capacities and resources, some nonprofit organizations,

especially those grass-root ones, would also formulate their strategies of using social media

tools informally. As Mintzberg (1994) has stated that an informal, simple, but explicit

strategy could help the organizations to implement it more creatively and flexibly.

To maintain and develop the stakeholders' relationship on social media, nonprofit organizations should prepare a comprehensive strategy. Regardless of the format, the strategy should provide the organization the ultimate goals of using social media, the target audience, the metrics of monitoring and evaluating the social media tools' performance, the timeline and the cost, and the plans of analyzing the results (Kanter & Paine, 2012).

The reality is that due to the limited resources, many nonprofit organizations only have some casual plans for using social media without specific goals, target audience, or any plans. But even if a basic strategy should help the organizations develop clear objectives to direct them to achieve the organizations' missions and values (Bryson, 2011). Having a strategy is so important that it indicates the responsibilities for the overall process of managing social media in nonprofit organizations (Ansoff, 1970; Mintzberg, 1994). It helps the organization to be consistent with the actions. Previous studies have found out that those nonprofit organizations have used strategies, even at a basic level, would have a better performance than those who do not have any (Herman & Renz, 1999; Siciliano, 2006). For this reason, this study examines that what the strategy that the nonprofit organization has to adopt for using social media currently. The study especially pays attention to what the primary objectives that the organizations adopt in their social media strategies.

To evaluate the strategy of how nonprofit organizations using their social media tools, this study used the typology of social media strategy from Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) work

in their study, "Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media" as a guide. In addition, the study also used the Lewis' et al. (2001) six communication models as a reference to adjust the typologies from Lovejoy and Saxton's work. These six communication models have been used to study with the stakeholders' relationships in different context. In Lewis et al. (2001) original work, these models were used to discuss how nonprofit organizations communicate with their stakeholders about the organizations' changes Timmerman (2003) used these models to discuss which types of media to choose when organizations need to communicate with their stakeholders.

Although these communication models have not been employed to exam how nonprofit organizations should operate their social media tools for public engagement, they show the relevance and useful characteristics to identify the patterns of strategy usage in this topic. To make it appropriate, the researcher first adjusted the six models into three ones for examining the social media strategies (equal dissemination, equal participation, and marketing). Then the study collects the contents from the targeted organizations' social media platforms. The researcher conducted a content analysis to identify the organizations' strategy patterns from different social media platforms.

The content analysis used the qualitative methodological tenets developed by Miles and Huberman (1984) and Strauss and Corbin (1998) to adjust Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) typologies. In addition, the study also used Lewis et al.'s (2001) communication strategies as the guide to modifying the strategies' categories for different social media. Then the

researcher classified the participated organizations into different social media strategies

categories.

Generally, most nonprofit organizations adopt social media as the information

dissemination tool (Campbell, Lambright, & Wells, 2014; Thomas & Streib, 2003; Waters et

al. 2009). Organizations, which adopt this strategy, usually use the social media as a channel

to release the news, the changes of the organizations, or the on-going activities. The primary

purpose of this strategy is to spread out the information. Initiating the conversations with the

stakeholders is not the focus. An example could be: a Facebook status like "get excited---we

are hiring!"; or a Tweet like "Prepping for our 33rd Antiques, Vintage & Garden Show! Event

starts February 20th!".

Basically, in this strategy, nonprofit organizations deliver the information to all of their

online stakeholders without any targets. The organization does not tent to send the

information based on any particular stakeholders' interests or needs either. Therefore, in this

strategy, getting an active conversation or feedback from the stakeholders are not the

organizations' first concern.

The second one is asking for participation strategy. Under this strategy, the organization

still give the social media updates without targeting on any specific stakeholders or groups.

However, different than the equal dissemination strategy, organizations use this strategy and

expect the stakeholders to participate in the organizations' social media platforms. To invite

the participation, the organizations give specific demands and openness to the stakeholders

on the updates. Sometimes, the organization also gives quick feedback if the stakeholders have comments, questions, or other requirements under the updates. This also encourages the stakeholders to give more participation. The examples could be a Facebook status like "We only need 5 more followers to reach 100 on Instagram! Follow us @masmacon," or a tweet like "100 Days to #FairSTL 2015! Share your favorite @FairSaintLouis memory with us and you could win a VIP Prize Package!"

The third strategy is the marketing strategy. Different than the previous two strategies, the unique part of this strategy is that organizations show the clear targeted audience that they are interested in. Under this strategy, the organization wants to send the message directly to those audiences with their specific interests and needs, and expect that the audience could make the reactions back. This also means that the organization does not put equal weight to all their online stakeholders when they adopt this strategy. In order to encourage the stakeholders' interactivity, the organizations should use a more motivate tone on the social media content. Furthermore, it should provide clear guidance to tell the stakeholders what the organizations want the stakeholders to do, such as making a donation, purchasing a product, or other specific actions. The examples could be that a Facebook status like "Help the studio come to life by pledging today! Donations in ANY amount make a difference!" Or a Tweet like "Thanks to @ArsenalCU for a great few weeks of shredding! We recycled nearly 10 tons of material during our shred days these past 2 Saturdays."

Lastly, some organizations may not have any clear strategy pattern on their social media

tools. The organization does not update on the social media page regularly or share some

irrelevant information on the platform. Examples could be a Facebook status like "Your

Saturday evening chuckle." Or a tweet likes "having a fun Sunday #Sunday."

Table 4: A Summary Table for the Variables

Variables Name	Measurement	Notes
Interaction Rate from the Organizations' social media platforms	• Interval Measurement • Using "Quintly" to observe the average interaction rate on organization's Facebook and Twitter in a month	• Dependent variable. • In this study, the interaction rates on Facebook and Twitter are collected separately. Therefore, the study will conduct two separate model to test performance on organizations' both Facebook and Twitter account.
Number of posts/tweets that the organization have on their Facebook/Twitter (in one month)	• Interval Measurement • The number of Facebook posts (status, pictures, links) in a month • The number of tweets that organization has on its Twitter in a month	• Independent variable for hypothesis 1 • This variable indicates the frequency that a nonprofit organization uses its Facebook and Twitter

Variables Name	Measurement	Notes
The types of strategy that the organization adopts to use the social media tools to engage with the stakeholders	• Categorical variable • Ordinal measurement • There are four categories in this variable: information, information & participation, information & marketing, information & participation & marketing • To identify which type of strategy a nonprofit organization uses on its social media, a content analysis is conducted	• This variable uses nominal measurement • A dummy variable is created to test how this independent variable impact on the dependent variable • The nonprofit organizations use information strategy on their social media are the reference group • Independent variable for hypothesis 2
Organization's size	• Interval measurement • Control variable	• Using the organization's annual revenue as the indicator

Quantitative Analysis

This study used IBM SPSS Statistic Premium GradPack 22 software to conduct the

quantitative analysis (IBM Corp., 2013). The multiple linear regression models were used to

examine the quantitative data. Multiple linear regression models are good for explaining the

cause relationships between the dependent variable and independent variables (Bickel, 2007).

The regression analysis can help to determine how much variation in the dependent variable

can be explained by the independent variables (Cohen, 2013). In addition, by interpreting the

standardized beta value of the independent variables, the regression models could also

indicate the relative importance of the independent variables. Before running the regression models, all the regression analysis assumptions were checked. These assumptions are 1. Independence of residuals 2. Linearity 3. Homoscedasticity issue 4. Multicollinearity issue 5. No significant outliers (Cohen, 2013).

The first regression model includes the interaction rate from the organizations' Facebook pages as the dependent variable, the number of Facebook posts, the types of the strategies, and the organization's size as the independent variables. Because the type of the strategies is a categorical variable, the study chose the first strategy, information dissemination, as the reference group. The main reason is because the information dissemination strategy is the basic strategy that almost all the organizations in the database adopt this one. Since the organizations adopting to this strategy is the reference group, it would not be shown in the regression models. The model equation should be addressed as below:

$$Y_{Interaction\ Rate(FB)} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 X_{no.of\ post(FB)} + \beta_2 X_{strategy2(FB)} + \beta_3 X_{strategy3(FB)} + \beta_4 X_{strategy4(FB)} + \beta_5 X_{org.size} + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

The second regression model includes the interaction rate from the organization's Twitter account as the dependent variable, the number of tweets, the different types of strategies, and the organization's size as the independent variables. The model equation should be addressed as below:

$$Y_{Interaction\ Rate(TW)} = \alpha_1 + \beta_6 X_{no.of\ tweets(TW)} + \beta_7 X_{strategy2(TW)} + \beta_8 X_{strategy3(TW)} + \beta_9 X_{strategy4(TW)} + \beta_{10} X_{Org.size} + \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

<u>Feasibility of the Study</u>

The research uses the Charity Navigator, the nation's largest and most-utilized evaluator of nonprofit sectors. The information from the website is reliable and easy to access to. By using the list from the Charity Navigator, the researcher could reach out each organization's official website through the Internet. On the website, the organization usually lists all the social media platforms that the public could follow with. The information from the organizations on social media is open to the public that researchers could reach out the important social media content.

To collect the data, the study uses Qunitly, a web-based social media analytic tool. The tool costs $993 for a month. The dissertation chair, Dr. Thomas Bryer, used his research funding to provide the financial support. Through the social media analytic tool, all the organizations' Facebook posts and Twitter Tweets on November 2015 can be tracked back and sorted in excel sheets.

For the content analysis, four graduate students from the school of Public Administration were hired for the coding. The students received two weeks of training (one week was for Facebook content, and the other week was for the Twitter content) with the coding scheme. During the entire coding process, the coders kept a weekly communication and updates to the researcher for any questions and updates.

After the data has been organized in the excel sheets, the SPSS 22.0 (IBM Corp., 2013). was run for the statistic's analysis.

Ethical Concerns

According to the University of Central Florida institutional review board (IRB), human research activities may be involved in, but not limited to "surveys, interviews, and focus groups to the collection of biological samples and clinical trials." In this study, part of the data directly from nonprofit organizations social networking sites (Facebook and Twitter). The content on the social networking sites are published by the organizations, and all the published content is open in public. The other part of the data is directly collected from the organizations' 990 Form, which is published on Charitynavigator.com. The 990 forms are required by the United States Internal Revenue Service, which would be considered as the public information. Therefore, there is no individual or confidential information will be collected in this study. In spite of it, this study still follows the ethical principles of human subject protection. Any personal or confidential data were not collected in this study. The data are contained in the researcher's computer. The social networking content was shared within the four coders. But after the coding process was finished, all the data has been removed from the coders' computers. All the data were only used for this research purpose.

CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS

Descriptive Findings

In this study, the study population focuses on art/culture/humanities nonprofit

organizations around the nation. To develop a study sample, the study randomly selected 200

nonprofit organizations, which concentrate on promoting artistic and cultural excellence and

protecting the cultural heritage, from the Charity Navigator. These organizations revenue

ranges from $568,980 to $660,935,260. The average revenue among these two hundred

organizations is $19,669,006. All of these organizations have successfully updated their

financial reports and Form 990 in the past three years to Charity navigator. This makes sure

that all the organizations have adequate resources for social media development that they are

relevantly comparable in the sample.

While collecting the data, the researcher checked whether each organization in the

sample had built an official Facebook and Twitter account. The result shows that all the

organizations in this study's sample have an official account on Facebook and Twitter.

However, this does not mean that these organizations are being active on these social

networking sites ordinary. The observation of these social media shows that 195

organizations were active on their Facebook page, and 168 organizations were being active

on their Twitter account between November 1st to November 30th in the database (n_1=195,

n_2=168). The number of the organization being active on Facebook and Twitter is 163. This

indicates that although nonprofit organizations realize the importance of adopting social

media networking sites, a few of them have not embraced the benefits of the technology essentially.

There were 195 nonprofit organizations being active on Facebook from November 1st to November 30th, 2015, and 168 being active on Twitter. Some nonprofit organizations in the sample might only be active on one social networking site. The study calculated each organization's average interaction rate from each of their social networking sites. To compare whether there is a statistically significant between two average interaction rates on Facebook and Twitter, this study used a Wilwxon t-Test. A Wilwxon rank-sum test is used as an alternative to the paired t-test to deal with the nonequivalent n in the two groups (Gehan, 1965). The result (see table 6) shows that there is a statistically significant different between the average interaction rates on the organizations' Facebook and Twitter ($p<0.05$). This indicates that nonprofit organizations on Facebook would receive a higher interaction than on Twitter. The online stakeholders were more engaged with the organizations on Facebook than on Twitter.

Table 5: Descriptive Findings

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Facebook Interaction	195	4.799	.0194	4.818	.482	.574
Facebook Frequency		207	1	208	39.90	36.162
Facebook Strategy1	18					
Facebook Strategy2	23	1	0	1	.12	.323
Facebook Strategy3	18	1	0	1	.09	.290
Facebook Strategy4	136	1	0	1	.70	.461
Active on Facebook	195					
Twitter Interaction	168	1.10	.00	1.10	.083	0.13
Twitter Frequency		667	1	668	57.57	82.14
Twitter Strategy1	21	1	0	1	0.13	0.34
Twitter Strategy2	47	0	1	0.28	0.45	1
Twitter Strategy3	21	0	1	0.12	0.33	1
Twitter Strategy4	79	1	0	1	.47	0.50
Active on Twitter	168					
Organization Size	200	660,366,28	568,980	660,935,26	19,222,964.5	57,097,075.9

On Facebook, n_1=195; On Twitter, n_2=168

The descriptive data also shows that on Facebook, all the active nonprofit organizations averagely delivered 40 posts per month. On Twitter, the active nonprofit organizations averagely delivered 58 tweets monthly. But a closer analysis shows that there were 18 nonprofit organizations gave less than 10 posts during a month on Facebook, and 39 nonprofit organizations gave less than 10 tweets on Twitter.

Comparing with Facebook, the database received more content from organizations'

Twitter account. During a month, the 195 nonprofit organizations totally gave 7,780 pieces of posts, and the 168 nonprofit organizations gave 9,730 pieces of tweets. On both platforms, some organizations only gave one post or tweet during one month. While on Facebook, the most active organization gave 207 posts in a month, and on Twitter, the most active one gave 668 tweets (see the range of Facebook and Twitter frequency in the table). More specifically, on Facebook, the most active nonprofit organization posted 10 times in a day; while on Twitter, the most active one gave 41 tweets in a day. Although it seems like some individual organizations produced more content on Twitter, most nonprofit organizations preferred to use Facebook in a daily based.

For the interaction rate, the descriptive findings show that on Facebook, the average interaction rate among all the nonprofit organizations is about 0.48. The range of the interaction rate is from 0.02 to 4.80. On Twitter, the average interaction rate is 0.08, and the range is from 0.00 to 1.10. These numbers indicate several interesting findings. First of all, although the data shows that nonprofit organizations tend to send more content and more frequently on Twitter, they receive a higher average interaction rate on Facebook. The range of the interaction rate on Facebook is also bigger than Twitter. Lastly, notice that even though some organization received really low interaction rate on its Facebook page, it did not reach zero. In contrast, on Twitter, some organizations gained no interaction rate at all after sending out the tweets. Overall, there were more nonprofit organizations being active on the Facebook page than on the Twitter. Those organizations being active on Twitter sent out more content

than those being active on Facebook.

Table 6: The Wilwxon t-test for A Comparison of Interaction Rates on Facebook and Twitter

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	FBInteraction - TwitterInteraction	.357	.451	.035	.288	.427	10.161	163	.000

The unit of analysis in this study is the individual nonprofit organization. Therefore, this study tried to observe and exam the strategy of using social networking sites at the organization level. After the coders had conducted the content analysis on each social media post, the researcher tried to group the organizations by the contents that they have sent out. As it has been mentioned in the analysis plan, the nine categories in the coding have been grouped into three broader types of strategies: 1. Information dissemination; 2. Asking for participation; 3. Marketing. According to this up-level classification, figure 3 and 4 shows the number of the organizations in each strategy.

Figure 3: The number of the organizations in each strategy on Facebook


Figure 4: The number of the organizations in each strategy on Twitter

The study found out that just as it is expected, most nonprofit organizations adopt the

information dissemination as the basic strategy on their social media platforms. Almost every organization in this sample has used this strategy on the platform. Among the 195 nonprofit organizations, which were active on Facebook during November 2015, there were 18 organizations used the information dissemination strategy as the only one on their posts. On Twitter, there were 21 nonprofit organizations just used the platform to disseminate the information. These organizations' primary and only goal of using the social media is to spread out the news about the organization itself. These organizations sometimes also sent out the public information, which might not be directly related to the organization's missions or programs. In addition, organizations would greet with their stakeholders on the Holidays and give some recognitions and thank you notes. Generally, these organizations did not try to build a conversation with their stakeholders or put enough effort into promoting their events. They did not use the social networking sites for selling their products or soliciting fundraising. These organizations did not take the full advantages of social media. To them, social media was just a supplement to the traditional media.

For a higher level of interactivity, there were some organizations sent out the content to ask for participation from the stakeholders and some adopt the marketing strategy. There are several ways to ask the stakeholders to participate in the organizations' activities. For instance, nonprofit organizations can ask the stakeholders to come to their special event, ask them to vote for the organizations or to initiate a dialogue in between. There were 23 organizations applied a combination of the information dissemination and asking for

participation as the strategy on Facebook, and this number on Twitter is 47. For these

organizations, social networking sites are not just a platform for publishing the news and

information. Additionally, the organizations understood that by sending out the social media

content, they could encourage and convince their online audience to join in the organizations'

activities online or offline. In the posts and tweets, the nonprofit organizations talked to their

stakeholders the organizations' needs and directed them how to support (such as giving the

details about how to go to the special event, what to do to vote for the organization, and ask

the questions to the stakeholders).

Lastly, the majority of the organizations in the sample began to adopt a comprehensive

strategy of using social networking sites for information dissemination, asking for

participation, and marketing purpose. On Facebook, this number is 136 out of 195

organizations, which occupied 70%; and on Twitter, this number is 79 out of 168, which

occupied 47%. First, most of these organizations gave more than 10 posts or tweets during

November 2015. If the organization did not give enough content on its social networking

sites, it was usually not capable of applying to multiple strategies. For example, if an

organization only gave one post on its Facebook page, it was not active enough to deliver

different types of content to interact with their stakeholders. Secondly, it seems like nonprofit

organizations were more creative and flexible to use different strategies on Facebook than

Twitter to engage with the stakeholders. There were more nonprofit organizations employed

the marketing strategy on Facebook than on Twitter too. One potential reason could be that

Twitter has the 140-characters limitation. This limitation restrains the amount of content that an organization could deliver on the platform. An interactive content requires some words with certain emotion, such as cheering, appreciate, being agitated. Without enough space, it is hard to express these emotions to content with the online audience. Smith, Fischer, and Yongjian (2012) has found out that comparing with Facebook, Twitter is more often used for quick daily updated than the culture of self-promotion. Their study also showed that there were more marketing related activities happening on Facebook posts than Twitters' tweets

The nonprofit organizations in the database published the different amount and types of the content when they face a variety of suitations and environment. Therefore, this study took a close look at these content and tried to analyze the pattern of using social media in these organizations. In the next section, it reviewed the content by the categories from the coding scheme. It also provided several examples with details to illustrate what content that nonprofit organizaitons deliever online to communicate with their stakeholders.

<u>The Social Media Content</u>

The study aims to observe and study the pattern of the strategies that nonprofit organizations use on their social media. Based on the literature review and empirical studies, this study summarized nine different categories about how nonprofit organizations posted on their social networking sites. These categories are 1. Direct information; 2. Indirect information; 3. Greeting information; 4. Giving recognition & thank you note; 5. Asking for

vote; 6. Dialogue initiation; 7. Promote an event; 8. Selling a product; 9. Soliciting the

donation. The results show that nonprofit organizations used their social media platforms in a

variety of ways.

In the final analysis, 5,519 Facebook posts and 5,004 Tweets were coded. The coding

results show that most nonprofit organizations used social media for information dissemination

purpose. Although there were a lot of nonprofit organizations also used the social media for

asking the participation purpose, most of them heavily used the platforms for promoting their

special events. Other types of asking the participation activities, such as asking for vote or

dialogue initiation, were relative low. As shown in figure 5 and 6, art/humanities/culture

nonprofit organizations have applied the marketing strategy on their social networking sites.

13.4% of all the Facebook posts and 7.57% of all the tweets were trying to sell nonprofit

organizations' products. These products included museum's tickets, theater show's tickets, gifts

from the gift stores, artist's work, and so on. Less than 5% of the posts and tweets were used

for fundraising solicitation.

Figure 5: How Nonprofit Organizations Use Their Facebook

Figure 6: How Nonprofit Organizations Use Their Twitter

Take a close to the 5,519 coded posts on Facebook, 31.58% were primarily using to deliver the direct information about the organization itself. On Twitter, this proportion is 39.2%. These posts updated what was happening in the organizations. The art/humanities/culture organizations really tried to deliver the news about their organizations in a creative way that a lot of them use pictures and videos. For example, towards to the end of November, many organizations posted the pictures about how they decorated their offices/buildings for the holidays. Sometimes, some nonprofit organizations also updated some pictures and videos after they host their special events. By delivering this type of information, organizations keep telling their stakeholders that what is happening right now. Also, these posts let the online stakeholders notice the updates around their local communities and strength the connection between them to the communities. Nah (2009) mentioned in his study that nonprofit organizations could potentially collect the social capital by sending out the online content on their websites, and without expecting the interactive actions from the stakeholders on the Internet.

The second category, sending out the indirect information, occupied 25.19% of the 5,519 coded posts on Facebook, and 29.68% of the 5,004 coded tweets on Twitter. In this category, nonprofit organizations were really being flexible and innovative in their social media's content. For instance, PEN America is an association of writers in the literary community. On Facebook, the organization posted the quotes from modern writers or the introduction of their new books. This information is not directly involved in the organization's operation or programs. However, it is indirectly related to the organization's mission and the value it was trying to pass around

the community. The indirect information is playing an important role on these nonprofit organizations' social networking sites. It is the public knowledge, which educates and advocates in public. If the indirect information is interesting and unique, it can immediately capture the online audience's attention and receives high interaction.

Figure 7 is an example of the indirect information that the George Washington Masonic National Memorial posted on its Facebook page. The post introduced a piece of history about George Washington with a picture of the art. Although this post did not mention anything about the organization's current status, programs, or event, it is still related to the organization's interest. This post received over 12,000 likes, 1,417 shares, and 44 comments, which was the highest interactive rate that the organization had during its November's posts (the organization has over 20,000 Facebook followers). This post indicated the interactive power of the indirect information between the nonprofit organization and its online stakeholders. The two parties were connected by the common interest. This suggests that comparing with the traditional media, on social media, rather than sending out the "me-now" type of information, nonprofit organizations should focus on delivering more "customer-centered" content. Nonprofit organizations need to think what their online stakeholders are most interested in and how can bond their interests to the organizations' values and beliefs.

Figure 7: An Example of Sending Indirect Information On Facebook
Source: George Washington Masonic National Memorial Facebook (November 4th, 2015)
https://www.facebook.com/gwmemorial/

"Promoting an event" is also a very popular type of content that the organizations used in this study. Within the 5,519 coded posts, 1,061 of them were used to promote nonprofit organizations' events, and within the 5,004 coded tweets, 555 were used for the same purpose. On this type of post, the nonprofit organization did not simply announce an event was held, but it gave a specific time, place, and what the event theme was on its post. Distinguishing with the information dissemination, when nonprofit organizations sent out this type of information, they expect the online stakeholders could attend the events. Therefore, to motivate the audience, organizations usually used action verbs in the content, such as "we want to see you there," "come out and join us," "do not miss the date…"

Many art/humanities/culture nonprofit organizations also used their social media to sell their products. On Facebook, there were 740 (13.4%) out of the 5,519 coded posts selling the

organizations' products to their stakeholders; while on Twitter, this number is 555 (7.57%) out of the 5,004 coded tweets. According to Clark, Maxwell, and Anestaki (2015), arts/humanities/culture type of nonprofit organizations heavily depend on private donation and community relations for their existence. Thus, this type of nonprofit organizations tends to be more engaged with their stakeholders through social media platforms to "entice donor support and ticket sales" (Clark, Maxwell, &Anestaki, 2015). In the coded posts and tweets, many theaters, museums, art studios tried to sell their tickets or products from their gift stores. Notice that this type of posts cannot simply be addressed by asking for donation or fundraising purpose. These posts do not necessarily always tell whether the money is for organization's administration or certain fundraising programs.

As a comparison, the posts and tweets directly about fundraising purpose are actually less than selling the product ones. Among the 5519 coded Facebook posts, 169 (3.1%) of them were for fundraising purpose, and in the 5004 coded Tweets, 82 (1.64%) were for the same purpose. These findings indicated that nonprofit organizations did not choose social media as an advanced fundraising tool, even though this could potentially bring the benefits to the organizations. In Flannery et al.'s study (2009), it found out that online giving was one of the significant ways that new and younger donors gave with larger gifts than the traditional donors. Nonprofit organizations can simply mention the fundraising activities with the pictures and the donation link. This helps to direct the online stakeholders to make the donations faster and convenient.

However, the way of motivating donors to give through social media is not easy. One potential challenge is putting appropriate and adequate information to solicit. This might be why on Twitter, organizations sent even fewer tweets about fundraising solicitation comparing the posts on Facebook. Twitter has a 140-characters limitation on the tweet. This potentially constraints the amount of the content that an organization could publish on its Twitter. To engage with the donors, nonprofit organizations need to provide evocative content, such as stories, updated pictures, emotional slogans, for fundraising actives. The 140 characters may not provide enough space for the evocative content. Figure 8 and 9 show that the different amount of social media content of fundraising solicitation that nonprofit organizations published on different social media platforms. From the comparison, it shows that on Facebook, nonprofit organizations can post relatively more information on one single post than one tweet. However, even on the Facebook post, the message is more like an announcement for the fundraising activity, rather than an evocative piece, which can engage with the stakeholders and prompt in making the donation. Thus, many nonprofit organizations have not adopted social networking sites as their fundraising tools.

Figure 8: An Example of Fundraising Solicitation on Facebook
Source: The Mark Twain House & Museum Facebook (November 11th, 2015)
https://www.facebook.com/MarkTwainHouse/?fref=ts

Figure 9: An Example of Fundraising Solicitation on Twitter
Source: Shubert Theatre Twitter (November 6th, 2015)
https://twitter.com/ShubertTheater/status/662746027909337088

Giving thank you note and recognition is related to the fundraising solicitation. It is one important strategy of relationship nurturing. Nonprofit organizations could post this type of information to appreciate the support from their stakeholders on social media. Sometimes, some organizations mentioned the key stakeholders specifically on their posts or tweets (by

using the @ symbol to tag the stakeholders). But a lot of times, organizations can also give a general thank you note to all their online stakeholders. In this case, the organizations do not necessarily expect the audience would reply back to their thank you note. The findings revealed that nonprofit organizations did not express their thank you note frequently on the social media. On Facebook, only 2.4% of the coded posts were giving the recognition and thank you note to the stakeholders, and this number on Twitter is 3.9%. Kim and Um (2016) found out that giving recognition and appreciation through social media could positively motivate the online giving behaviors. The challenge is many nonprofit organizations did not capture the timely and proper chance to express the appreciation on their social networking sites. Figure 10 is an example of showing how one nonprofit organization sent out the thank you note to the donors. Even though the message did not tag any specific donor, it still played an important role in stakeholders' engagement. First of all, it showed the organization cared about its stakeholders. Maybe the expression of the appreciation does not always receive the the online stakeholders' responses, but without showing it, the appreciation cannot be recognized (Dutton, Worline, Frost, & Lilius, 2006). Secondly, by sending out this thank you note, it highlighted what the donation was for. People, who did not notice for the first time, would have a second chance to make the donation.

Figure 10: An Example of Sending Thank You Note
Source: The Ordway Twitter (November 12th, 2015)
https://twitter.com/theordway/status/664971011469742080

Since the data was collected in November, some nonprofit organizations sent out the thank you note on Thanksgiving day. It is a smart strategy that the organizations did not only show the appreciation, but also greet with the stakeholders as a friend on social networking sites. This is involved into another category of the strategy of using social networking sites---greeting. As the literature review has mentioned, one of the social networking sites' features is that it is developed based upon individuals' real-life social network (Mergel, 2012). Figure 11 is an example of how nonprofit organizations sending the holiday greeting information to its online stakeholders. If a person chose to follow an organization's Facebook or Twitter, the organization's feed will be like the rest of this person's friends' feed on its social networking sites. Thus, nonprofit organizations could greet to their stakeholders as their friends. The finding shows that a few nonprofit organizations tried to be causal and friendly on their social media content. On Facebook, 2.5% of the coded posts were about greeting type of information; and on Twitter, this number is 2.7%. Organizations sent "good morning," "Happy Friday," and

"Happy Holidays" on their content. Figure 8 is a typical greeting information that one nonprofit organization sent out. As a theater, this organization was creative to cite Shakespeare's quote to spread the holiday spirit in the content. In this way, stakeholders did not only receive the greeting, but also hear the art value that this organization was passing around. In this study's sample, most nonprofit organizations chose to greet with their stakeholders on holidays and there are only two major holidays on November (The Veteran Day and The Thanksgiving Day). Thus, although the total number of the posts and tweets for greeting is relatively low, the number of the organizations adopt this strategy is encouraging. Among all the active organizations on Facebook, 95 out of 195 organizations (48.7%) posted the greeting type of content. On Twitter, there were 74 out of 167 organizations (44.3%) tweeted the greeting content to their online stakeholders.

Figure 11: An Example of Sending the Greeting Information
Source: The Public Theater Twitter (November 26th, 2015)
https://twitter.com/PublicTheaterNY/status/669924321712844801

While both categories, "sending the thank you note" and "greeting message," do not

necessarily require a response from the online stakeholders, nonprofit organizations sometimes

do expect to have some conversations with them. Therefore, one of the categories in the

strategy of using social media is dialogue initiation. In accordance with the empirical studies,

the results of this study suggest that nonprofit organization did not put enough effort on

initiating a dialogue with their online stakeholders (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Saxton & Lovejoy,

2012; Waters & Jamal, 2011). In the coded data, there were only 2.3% Facebook posts, and

3.68% Tweets filled under the "initiating dialog" category. Nonprofit organizations did not

usually ask questions or input from their online stakeholders on their social media. The content

shows that even if some nonprofit organizations asked questions to the stakeholders, they

usually asked for opinions or questions unrelated to organization's operation. Figure 12 is an

example of a nonprofit organization asked a question to their online stakeholders. Nonprofit

organizations have some concern about how appropriate to build a conversation with their

online stakeholders. What should be discussed and how much should be discussed on social

networking sites? As Campbell et al. (2014) have observed that many nonprofit leaders worried

about building a conversation could be bias and mislead. In the database in this study, there are

several nonprofit TV channels or radios. They tended to report the news accurately and

neutrally, but not got involved in the discussion under their news posts.

Figure 12: An Example of Dialogue Initiation
Source: WFUV Public Radio (November 27th, 2015
https://www.facebook.com/WFUVPage/?fref=ts

However, there are also some good opportunities that nonprofit organizations could build

some good conversations with their stakeholders about their special events, shows, and the

discussion about the art work. A few times, the organizations did, but most of the time, the

majority did not capture the opportunities.

Asking for the stakeholders to vote is another way to let the stakeholders participate in

the philanthropic activities. However, the proportion of this type of content is also relatively

low in the findings. On Facebook, there were 28 posts (0.5% of the total) asking the

stakeholders for vote; and on Twitter, there were also 28 tweets (which was 0.56% of the

total) asking for vote. This finding is consistent with Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012)

observation that asking for vote is not a primary purpose for nonprofit organizations to

engage with their stakeholders. In their study, the proportion of this strategy is 1.2% (total

number of the coded tweets is 4,655).

Overall, nonprofit organizations used social networking sites for various purposes. Information dissemination is still organization's primary aim of using social networking sites. Applying to the marketing strategy is an important goal for Art/humanities/culture nonprofit organizations since they depend on private donations more than the government grants comparing with other types of nonprofit organizations (Clark, Maxwell, &Anestaki, 2016). On the two different social networking sites, Facebook and Twitter, nonprofit organizations have a similar pattern of using social networking sites. Although on a different platform, the same nonprofit organization usually would publish totally different content. On Twitter, nonprofit organizations would also create special hastag (using the "#" symbol to stand out the key words) on their tweets, which was not commonly used on Facebook.

Before running the regression analysis, the study checked the correlations among the independent variables. The results show that only the first strategy of using social networking sites, information dissemination, has some correlation with other strategies. However, since the information dissemination strategy has been treated as the reference group in the linear regression analysis, this independent variable will not be put into the analytic model.

The study also checked the normality of each variable. Due to the range of the organization's size (annual revenue) is big, this independent variable is not normal distributed. Therefore, in the final regression analytic model, the nature log of this variable was then taken instead.

<u>Regression Analysis</u>

In this study, it tried to observe and exam how nonprofit organizations and their online stakeholders interacted on two different social networking sites, Facebook and Twitter. Therefore, multiple linear regression models have been conducted.

The first regression analysis focuses on the strategies and the stakeholders' engagement on nonprofit organizations' Facebook page. The dependent variable is the organization's average interaction rate from their Facebook fans during November 2015. The independent variables include the number of the posts that the organizations published on their Facebook pages and the type of the strategies that the organizations adopt. In the second regression analysis, it focuses on the strategies and the stakeholders' engagement on nonprofit organizations' Twitter account. The dependent variable is the organization's average interaction rate from their Twitter followers. The independent variables include the number of the tweets that the organizations had and the type of the strategies. The natural log value of the organizations' size is the control variable in both regression analysis models.

Since the type of the strategies is a categorical variable, each category is treated as the dummy variable. As the literature guided and the observation from the data, information dissemination is the prevalent strategy on nonprofit organizations' social networking sites, it has been considered as the reference group in the regression analysis.

The results show that hypothesis 1 is not supported. Either on organizations' Facebook page or on their Twitter account, posting the content more frequently did not help the

organizations receive a higher engagement rate. In fact, in the database, there were a few nonprofit organizations delivered too many posts or tweets during a one-month period. This actually decreased the online stakeholders' engagement.

For example, Hammer Museum at UCLA tweeted 118 times during November. The average interaction rate among all these tweets is 0.016. The Hartford Stage is another nonprofit organization, which gave 6 tweets during the same time (see figure 13). The average interaction rate is 0.039. Both organizations applied the second strategy, a combination of information dissemination and asking for participation, on their social networking sites. Both organizations' interaction rates are relatively low. But as the figure shows, Hammer Museum at UCLA used their Twitter daily. Sometimes, the organization tweeted over 10 times per day. When the organization used its social networking sites to send out too much information, the online stakeholders might be reluctant to receive all of them on their personal social network sites. Carboni and Maxwell (2016) found out that there was an inverse relationship between the frequency of nonprofit organizations using their social networking sites and their stakeholders' engagement rate. The more the organization posts on its online platform, the less engagement it would gain from their online followers. However, this does not mean that organizations should be inactive on its social networking sites. As the example shows, Hatford Stage did not give enough presence on its Twitter. And this could also potentially lose the opportunities to interact with their online stakeholders.

Figure 13: An Example of the Difference between Two Organizations' Tweets' Frequency

The stakeholders' engagement rate might not just be related to how frequently a nonprofit organization uses, but what strategies that the organization adopts to motivate and engage with their online audience. In the regression analysis, it examined which type strategy could help the organization to gain a higher interaction rate on Facebook and Twitter. The information dissemination is the basic strategy. The second strategy is a combination of information dissemination and asking for participation. The third combination is information dissemination and marketing strategy. And last, a nonprofit organization can adopt a comprehensive strategy, which includes information dissemination, asking for participation, and marketing strategy.

On Facebook, the analysis shows that there is no statistical significant between the the type of the strategies and the stakeholders' interaction rate. The data indicates that on Facebook, the organization's followers would react to organization's posts without any clear pattern.

On Twitter, the results show that if a nonprofit organization used a combination of information dissemination and asking for participation strategy, it would negatively impact on

the followers' interaction rate (β_9 = -0.055, p<0.05). And if a nonprofit organization used a combination of information dissemination and marketing strategy, it would negatively impact on its followers' interaction rate (β_{10} = -0.066, p<0.05). But overall, the linear relationship between the interaction rate and the frequency of using social networking sites, the strategies, and the organization's size is weak ($R^2_{Facebook}$ = 0.027; $R^2_{Twitter}$ = 0.106).

Table 7: The Findings of Regression Analysis

Independent variables	Facebook	Twitter
Organization's size (Ln)	-0.025	-0.024*
	(0.033)	(0.008)
Frequency of using the social networking site	-.0.001	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.000)
Strategy2: information dissemination and asking for participation	0.037	-0.055*
	(0.181)	(0.032)
Strategy3: information dissemination and marketing	0.266	-0.066*
	(0.193)	(0.087)
Strategy4: information dissemination, asking for participation, and marketing	-0.024	-0.046
	(0.145)	(0.030)
Intercept	0.894	0.515
	(0.526)	(0.126)
F	1.371	1.269
Total R^2	0.027	0.106
Adjusted R^2	0.002	0.078

Note: The dependent variable for the Facebook model is the interaction rate from organizations' Facebook page. The dependent variable for the Twitter model is the interaction rate from organizations' Twitter account. This Table shows regression coefficients, with standard error in parentheses. *p<0.10, n1=195, n2=168.

One potential reason could be that how stakeholders engage with their nonprofit organizations on social networking sites does not only depend on how frequently the organization presents on, and what type of strategies that the organization used. Rather, it might be more related to the specific content that each organization posted on their online platforms. In the database, the content analysis shows that there are a few nonprofit organizations adopted a less comprehensive strategy of using their social media but still received a high engagement rate.

California Historical Society is a good example. On the organization's Facebook page, it totally gave 32 posts during one month. Most of these posts were using to disseminate the information to the public. Several posts were using to ask the stakeholders for participating in their events or joining in a dialogue. No marketing strategy was applied. The organization's interaction rate through all the posts is 1.05, which is higher than the average interaction rate (mean = 0.482) among all the organizations in the sample. In one of the organization's post, the interaction rate is 14. 67 (see figure 14). The post was a piece of indirect information educating the public about the first Acid Test was happening 50 years ago in California. This means that after the organization had uploaded this post, most of its Facebook fans gave a certain reaction (like, comment, or share) to it.

Figure 14: An Example of a Facebook Post with High Interaction Rate
Source: California Historical Society (November 27th, 2015)
https://www.facebook.com/californiahistoricalsociety/posts/

Under this post, the online stakeholders displayed their interests about the knowledge.

There were many people provide more inputs about this post by giving extra related

information, asking questions, and different opinions. This is different than the scholars'

argument that the information dissemination type of social media content encourages lower

interactivity within the online audience (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010; Waters & Jamal, 2011).

Sometimes, if the organization send out the right information, it can still promote the

stakeholders to interact with the organizations actively. The challenge is to find out what is

the "right" information.

Some scholars argued that the "right" content should help to initiate a conversation

between the organization and its stakeholders (Curtis et al., 2010; Waters & Jamal, 2011). For

instance, nonprofit organizations could ask a question to their stakeholders on the social

networking sites. However, in the database, the finding revealed that if the organization asked

a question, which cannot intrigue the stakeholders' interests, it still did not receive a high

interaction rate. In fact, the results from the Twitter analysis indicated that if a nonprofit

organization pushed too much on its stakeholders to ask them to participate in or have a

dialogue, it would put off the stakeholders' online engagement. KCTS9 is a nonprofit

television channel. On its Twitter account, it totally delivered 368 tweets during November

2015. Among the 56 coded tweets, the interaction rate is 0.034, which is lower than the

average interaction rate from all the organizations in the sample (The mean of Twitter

interaction rate = 0.083, n_2 =168). The organization tried to interact with the stakeholders by

asking questions. Figure 15 is an example of its tweets. The tweet shared a link about the test

of becoming an American citizen. It asked the online audience to try this test and let the

organization know their result by using the Twitter. However, the interaction rate of this tweet

is 0.064. The tweet did not show a clear connection between the content and the organization.

The stakeholders, who follow this organization's Twitter, are more likely interested in the

news or shows on this channel. However, this tweet was not clear enough of showing whether

the citizenship test was related to any news or policy changes. The hashtag also did not

suggest clearly that why the citizen test was related to the immigration reform. The tweet

failed to capture the stakeholders' interests. As a result, it did not receive a high interaction

from the stakeholders. This implies the quality of the content matters more than how often an

organization uses on its social networking sites. Moreover, a general strategy of using the

social networking site may be not always helpful to direct the organization to gain a higher

interaction from its online stakeholders.

Figure 15: An Example of Dialogue Initiation on Twitter
Source: KCTS 9 Twitter (November 23rd, 2015)
https://twitter.com/KCTS9/status/668688944708452353

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study aims to observe and analyze how nonprofit organizations use their social networks strategically to interact with their online stakeholders. In this section, it first summarizes the research questions and hypotheses that this study proposed. Then it highlights the key findings and conclusions, and illustrate the specific contributions and practical implication that this study has produced. This section also discussed the limitations of the study and encourageed future researches to improve the analysis and results.

Conclusions and Practical Implications

Centralize the Resource for Social Media

The first practical implication for nonprofit organizations is to centralize the limited resource on the most effective social media. In this study, it found out that this social media should be Facebook. As this dissertation discussed in the beginning, nonprofit organizations face a growing challenge of competitive environment and limited resources. A lot of nonprofit organizations may not have enough budget or staff member to manage multiple social media. Under this circumstance, those grass rooted nonprofit organizations should preserve their strength on one social media, which could help the organization gets the most interaction from its online stakeholders.

There are several reasons. First, the descriptive finding indicates that both nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders tended to use Facebook more than Twitter. This is

consisting of the new observations from Pew Research Center (2016) that Facebook is still

the most popular social media tool around the nation (see figure 16). It is known that new

types of social media emerge all the time. Snapchat, Instagram, Reddit…provide fantastic

new functions. However, in comparison to other social media tools, Facebook has been

accepted by the public longer and prevalently. And nonprofit organizations and their

stakeholders are more comfortable to use Facebook to interact with. Because of that,

nonprofit organizations have a bigger chance to engage with more potential stakeholders

from Facebook.

However, in the database, a few nonprofit organizations were still being inactive on its

Facebook page. 5 nonprofit organizations (n = 200) did not give a single post during one

month, yet all of them having a Facebook page. These organizations missed out the

opportunities to engage with the potential stakeholders from the most widely used social

media. Nonprofit organizations should understand that having a presence on its social media

platform does not mean it would benefit the organization's network development, raising

awareness, or gaining intangible and tangible support.

Figure 16: Social Media Updates 2016
Source: Pew Research Center
http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/11/11/social-media-update-2016/

In this study, even though the finding indicated that Facebook was more popular,

nonprofit organizations should not neglect the usage of Twitter. In fact, the data shows that

there were more nonprofit organizations being inactive on their Twitter account than on the

Facebook. These organizations also lost the potential stakeholders from a different social

media channel. There are many studies have shown that nonprofit organizations could receive

high engagement from their stakeholders if they use Twitter wisely. Some studies observed

that Twitter is a better communication tool when nonprofit organizations need to manage

some emergent situation. Muralidharan and Shin (2011) found out that when the Haitian

earthquake happened, nonprofit organizations, such as the Red Cross, received a high volume

on Twitter. Messner and his research team also thought that Twitter is a good social media

tool for having a direct conversation between nonprofit organizations and their followers (Messner, Jin, Medina-Messner, Meganck, Quarforth, &Norton, 2013). In a word, Twitter has the potentials to develop a stronger relationship between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders. However, the study found out that art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations have not figured it out how to engage effectively with their Twitter followers. Some of the organizations delivered too many tweets daily, which were unrelated to their stakeholders' interests and gained low interactivity.

Another problem is that the descriptive findings revealed that most nonprofit organizations used Facebook and Twitter with similar strategic plans. On both Facebook and Twitter, nonprofit organizations' primary goal was to expressing the information equally to all their online stakeholders. The second popular purpose of using Twitter was to promote an event. Notice that nonprofit organizations did not adopt Twitter as a communication tool, which overlooked the special advantage of this social media tool. Many scholars pointed it out that nonprofit organizations should apply different strategies to different social media tools (Muralidharan et al., 2011; Smith, Fischer, Yongjian, 2012). But this study observed that most nonprofit organizations treated their social media platforms equally with similar usage patterns. Therefore, the study concluded that nonprofit organizations should employ various types of strategies for using different social media tools. More emphasis shall be put on Twitter. And building a dialogue should be the first concern for nonprofit organizations of using Twitter.

More social media is always exciting. However, it also requires extra time and resource to manage these multiple platforms. Nonprofit practitioners questioned that how many social media they should adopt at once? Is it necessary to always embrace the new social media? This dissertation thought that if the organization has limited capacity, it should focus on the basic social media. One of the special contributions in this study is that it observed and compared how nonprofit organizations used two different social media tools (Facebook and Twitter). There are few studies have discussed how nonprofit organizations should adopt different social media tools in different ways. Most of the studies examined nonprofit organizations' social media behaviors either on Facebook, Twitter, or YouTube (Briones et al., 2011; Guo & Saxton, 2014; Waters et al., 2009). In this study, it collected and analyzed the social media activities from both the organizations' Facebook and Twitter. It helps the scholars and practitioners to learn how the art/culture/humanities used their Facebook and Twitter; what types of content that they delivered on each social media platform; and whether the organizations should consider different strategies for using different social media tools.

Social Media Content Matters

To answer the research questions, this study developed an immense database for both the quantitative and qualitative analysis. this study adopted a mixed method of quantitative and qualitative analysis. Totally, the database contains 200 art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations' social media performance during one month around the nation. There were

9,703 pieces of Facebook posts and 7,841 pieces of Tweets collected. Among them, 5,519

pieces of Facebook posts and 5,004 Tweets have been selected for the final analysis. The

social media content was used to detect whether nonprofit organizations to interact with their

stakeholders strategically on the social media. The statistic tests helped to examine the

organizations' strategies and patterns of using social media. But the intense amount of the

content analysis gave more vivid stories and details about how nonprofit organizations

exactly adopt their social media tools to interact with their stakeholders.

For the content analysis, the study adjusted the typologies of using social media from

Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) work and Lewis et al.'s communication models to a new coding

scheme. The study did not only provide the explicit examples to illustrate the coding scheme

but also gave a comprehensive explanation of how each specific example was used to interact

with the organizations and their online stakeholders. Using sending out the indirect

information as an example, the study first described the definition of this category. Then the

study specified the coding category by giving the actual social media content from the

organizations. The quantitative analysis certainly indicated some forms of how nonprofit

organizations using their social media tools. For instance, one of the quantitative results

suggested that sending out the indirect information could also help the organization to gain a

high interaction rate from their stakeholders. In addition, in order to show the statistic

numbers from the quantitative analysis, this study tried to tell the readers what words,

pictures, and tones that the organization posted on its social media content to communicate

with their audience.

The content analysis presents that what certain social capital that the organizations and their stakeholders would like to exchange on the social media tools. By the analysis, the study concluded that nonprofit organizations and their online stakeholders are more likely to be boned by the common interests, but not just the organizations' "me-now" type of information. Nonprofit organizations should seriously consider what type of information that they could post on the social media platform. Simply posting the missions, updates about the programs, or what is happening in the organization today may not catch the online stakeholders' interests. And all that information can be delivered on the organization's traditional media, such as newsletters, posters, or the organization's website. The stakeholders do not want to receive the repeated materials. The overwhelmed and repeated social media content could be seen as the inappropriate strategies, and could really scare the potential stakeholders away (Hung, 2002). Nonprofit organizations should avoid of using social media tools simply as an alternative way of presenting their own organizations' information on the website.

The special feature of social media is that it allows the organizations and the stakeholders to exchange the social capitals. The ultimate goal of building communication and other types of interaction is to develop an exchange process between the organizations and their supports. Many previous studies argued that a two-way communication strategy is the best one to apply to social media tools for nonprofit organizations strengthening the online stakeholders'

relationship (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Ingenhoff & Koelling, 2009; Kang & Norton, 2003; Kent & Taylor, 1998). Guo and Saxton (2014) thought that an effective strategy of using social media to engage with the stakeholders was to build a dialogic function on the social media content. However, this study argues that other than developing a dialog on social media tools, other strategies, such as information dissemination and marketing, can still help nonprofit organizations to exchange the social capital with their online stakeholders. For example, if a nonprofit organization send out the interesting information to educate the public, it can still bond the stakeholders by exchanging the common interests, beliefs, and values. It is not always necessary to acquire the online followers and fans' interaction by having a conversation. Sending out a holiday greeting post, or giving the recognition may not attract the stakeholders' immediate reaction, but in the long term, the stakeholders may feel the care from the organizations and a public trust is still possible to grow. In conclusion, the study wants to emphasize that the content itself matters more than the conversation. Nonprofit organizations do not only want to hear back from their stakeholders but also to receive other types of tangible or intangible social capitals.

Customized Your Own Strategies

Using social media does require some sort of strategies. This study proved that if a nonprofit organization gave overwhelmed and repeated social media content without engaging with the stakeholders' interests, it would earn low or no interaction. Without a well-

designed strategy and attractive content, it does not matter that how frequently an

organization appears on its social media tools---their online stakeholders cannot connect with

them on the platforms.

The results of the regression analysis did not support the hypotheses of using different

strategies could impact on the interaction rate with the stakeholders. Part of the reason could

be that some groups of using different strategies are relatively small, which is not powerful

enough for the analysis. For example, on Facebook, among the 200 organizations, there were

only 18 organizations used the single information dissemination strategy, 23 organizations

used the information dissemination and asking for participation strategies, and 18

organizations used and information dissemination and marketing strategies. But there were

136 organizations used a combination of information dissemination, asking for participation,

and marketing strategies. This imbalance of the distribution could affect the result of the

analysis. Moreover, for those nonprofit organizations adopt a comprehensive strategy, each

individual of them was still acting differently on their social media platforms. First of all, the

number of their posts or tweets were diverse. On Facebook, the range of the posts was from 1

to 207. And on Twitter, this range was even bigger (from 1 to 667). Secondly, there was also

an imbalance of choosing different strategies on organizations' social media tools. Some

organizations were more in favor of using the social media to disseminate the information,

even though they also adopt the asking for participation and marketing strategies. In opposite,

some organizations aimed to use the social media tools more for asking the stakeholders'

participation, but they also used the other strategies within smaller proportion. There were also organizations adopt each strategy equally on their social media. In a word, each organization kind of had its own unique way of using the online tools.

To give the nonprofit practitioners a good idea of whether using social media could effectively engage with the stakeholders, this study tried to display several examples of the successful posts and tweets with high interactions, and the inefficient ones with low interactivity as well. The study tends to fulfill the stories behind the numbers from the statistic tests.

Nonprofit leaders should understand that the best strategy of using social media is the one, which can fit into the organization's missions and programs appropriately. If you are a museum, a dance studio, or a musical theater, your organization may want to be flourished by selling more tickets and engaging with the clients with more marketing activities. If you are a radio station or a TV channel, social media could be a good channel to send out the most updated news or shows to the public. If you are a culture institution or a library, using social media to educate the public can attract the stakeholders' common interests and be rewarded with high interaction rate. The key is that organizations should create the objectives of using social media based on its own missions, values, and structure. There is no that one-fit-all solution for all the organizations. A good way to learn your own strategy is to collect what your organization post daily on Facebook and Twitter and track what the stakeholders' interaction afterwards. It really helps to develop a customized strategy for the individual

nonprofit organization.

<center>Limitations</center>

This study has several limitations. These limitations potentially impact on the results.

First of all, to analyze the strategy, this study only collected the data from the nonprofit

organizations' Facebook and Twitter. The real content is helpful to reveal some of the

strategic patterns that the nonprofit organizations adopt social networking sites to interact

with their stakeholders, but it still has the limitation to disclose the entire strategy from each

nonprofit organization. A strategy, especially a strategy focusing on engaging with nonprofit

organizations' stakeholders, should contain the clear objectives, the target audience, and

specific plans for processing. In this study, by using the content analysis, it generally assigned

three goals of using social networking sites in nonprofit organizations: 1. Information

dissemination; 2. Asking for participation; 3. Marketing purpose. Along with these three

goals and the guidance from the empirical studies (Lewis, Hamel, & Richardson, 2001;

Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012), this study also developed nine categories about why nonprofit

organizations utilize their social networking platforms. These categories are 1. Sending out

the direct information about the organization; 2. Sending out the indirect information about

the organization; 3. Sending out the greeting information; 4. Giving recognition and thank

you note; 5. Initiation the dialogue; 6. Promoting an event; 7. Asking for vote; 8. Selling a

product; 9. Soliciting the donation. Although these categories contain the majority of the

<center>123</center>

purposes of why nonprofit organizations adopt the social networking sites, they may still miss some unique goals that why the organizations chose to launch into the online platforms. For instance, Mottner and Ford (2005) thought that one of the major strategic goals of using social media for the museum was educating the public online. Different organizations with different missions and programs may have a variety of purposes of using their social networking sites.

Similarly, nonprofit organizations may have their unique targeted audience to attract on the social networking sites. This study assumed that there were three major types of stakeholders that the organizations were always trying to target on their social networking sites: donors, clients, and volunteers. But when conducted the content analysis, the research was only able to examine the data from the organizations' end. It did not analyze the data from the stakeholders' perspective. In the analysis, it did not distinguish the differences between different types of stakeholders. In reality, the organizations could potentially be interested in interacting different types of stakeholders, such as local government agencies, potential collaborators, or even some private partners. By the observation directly from the organizations' social media platforms, the study might not be able to capture these other potential purposes and target audience. This also might be why the data was not strong enough to gain the statistic significant results from the regression analysis. Future studies should try to observe and study the different behaviors that each type of stakeholders have on social media.

A survey design or conducting more interviews with the organizations may help to reveal more specific strategic plans and stories about the usage of social networking sites. Moreover, a survey would allow the researcher to investigate more detailed questions about the process of using the social networking sites. For example, in the survey, the researcher could ask that whether the nonprofit organizations have assigned any specific personal staff to manage the social networking sites. This will help to understand that how much the nonprofit organization invests in adopting the strategy of using social networking sites. The survey could also ask that how much time that a nonprofit organization spends on using its social networking sites daily. This could be another angle of testing how frequently that a nonprofit organization uses its social networking sites. In other words, a survey analysis or conducing more interviews would always give more power to both the quantitative and qualitative analysis in this study. By just collecting most of the data directly from the organizations' Facebook and Twitter could limit this power.

Another limitation is that it only focuses on the analysis of the organizations' Facebook page and Twitter account. Although these two social networking sites have been identified as the most popular employed ones in the nonprofit field, the most updated study also shows that newer types of social networking sites grow faster as well (Pew Research Center, 2016). For example, Instagram, Pinterest, and LinkedIn all attracted more users in 2016 than Twitter. These newer types of social networking sites may carry more exciting and advanced social media genres, which this study did not cover up. For instance, Instagram just launched a new

function, called "story," on its platform. This new function allows the users to upload a short-video clip, rather than a static picture on the platform. This allows the users to give more inputs and self-promotion in a virtual environment. And this change could affect on nonprofit organizations' strategies of using their social networking sites. From both the practitioners' and the researchers' opinions, nonprofit organizations should always apply different strategies on different social media platforms (Kanter & Paine, 2012; Smith, Fischer, & Yongjian, 2012). The behaviors from both the organizations and their stakeholders might be totally different than the findings from the Facebook and Twitter.

The study only collected one-month data from the organizations'' social media platform. This could be a weakness for the data collection process. The relationship between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders may require some time to develop and maintain. One month might not be long enough for cultivating the relationship with social media. Also, they study selected November to collect the data. Although it is well known that November is close to the holiday seasons, which is also the time that most nonprofit organizations seek to donations and gifts from their stakeholders, some nonprofit organizations are more active in the other months possibly during the year. Future studies should expand the period of collecting the data and produce a time-series analysis.

Lastly, this study should consider to include more nonprofit organizations' attributes into the analysis. For instance, how long a nonprofit organization has adopted its social networking sites could potentially impact on the development of the strategies. Clark,

Maxwell, and Anestaki (2015) also thought that those nonprofit organizations depended more on local communities and private donors were willing to put more effort on engaging the stakeholders on social media than those organizations heavily depended on government grants. Again, for this type of information, a content analysis from the organizations' social media platform is hard to capture. A survey design with specific questions to the organization's executive directors might help to expose more potential variables, which could impact on the development of social media strategies.

<div align="center">Future Research</div>

Although the study has several limitations, these limitations also offer some good opportunities for future researches of the topic that how nonprofit organizations adopt their social networking sites strategically and engage more with their online stakeholders. As several scholars have pointed it out that social networking sites are relatively new and keep changing all the time, it is not surprising that the research about how to develop and manage these advanced tools in public and nonprofit organization field is still under development (Campbell et al., 2014; Jung & Valero, 2015; Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Mergel and Bretschneider, 2013). Especially the researches focusing on the creative ways of using social networking sites to interact with different stakeholders in the nonprofit field.

As it has been mentioned in the limitation, this study has examined several interesting strategic variables, but it can examine more nonprofit organization's special attributes. In this

study, it selected the art/culture/humanities type of nonprofit organizations, because this type of organizations is shifting heavily to the commercial activities (Massarsky & Beinhacker, 2002). A lot of them operate towards to business pattern and adopt marketing strategies (Clark, Maxwell, &Anestaki, 2016; Massarsky & Beinhacker, 2002). However, other types of nonprofit organizations may have different behaviors and activities on their social networking sites. Future studies should try to collect and test the social media content from different types of nonprofit organizations. Other organizations with different missions, such as environment, education, human services, might adopt social networking sites with alternative strategies. A comparison of how these different organizations interact with their stakeholders on the social media platforms will be interesting.

This study collected abundant data from the organizations' social networking sites. The unit of analysis in this study is the individual nonprofit organization. Some other studies have conducted the analysis on the message-level that the unit of analysis would be the individual piece of social media content (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Saxton & Waters, 2014). Future studies could consider a more comprehensive analysis, such as the multilevel linear regression models. The lower level focuses on the individual social media content, and the upper level should be involved in the organization's level. A multi-level regression might not only capture the strategic patterns from each social media post, but also from the different organizations' structures. Furthermore, future studies should also consider of applying to nonlinear regression models. As this study has indicated that there was no clear linear

relationship between the type of the strategies and the stakeholder's interaction rate. But it does not mean that there is no relationship between the variables. There could be a curved relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables. Some higher-ordered values of the predictors should be considered.

To conduct a more comprehensive and advanced analysis, future studies could always reach out nonprofit organizations by sending out the surveys, having interviews, or holding the focus groups for more quantitative and qualitative data collections. The survey design and the interviews can ask the organizations more specific questions about how they prefer to use social networking sites and what the challenges they are facing with. This study, along with many pervious articles, has observed that most nonprofit organizations did not put enough effort on building a two-way communication strategy of using its social networking sites (Ingenhoff & Koelling, 2009; Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Shier & Handy, 2012; Waters et al., 2009). These scholars keep proposing that organizations should emphasize on building in a dialogic function in their social media content. In reality, there is little known that why nonprofit organizations are resisting or reluctant to adopt this two-way communication strategy. Campbell et al. (2015) explained that nonprofit organizations, which provide the human services, often face the situation to protect their clients or stakeholders' private information. But do other types of nonprofit organizations need to handle this challenge as well? Do they have other administrative obstructs to operate their online tools, such as there is no enough personnel support, tied-up budget, or another conflict of interests? These

answers can only be answered by the executive teams in the organizations.

Summary

This study is interested in learning how art/culture/humanities nonprofit organizations adopt social media tools to interact with their stakeholders, including clients, donors, and volunteers. Notice that most nonprofit organizations nowadays have already embraced the idea of having the social media account, this study took a close look at how nonprofit organizations use this advanced technology to interact with the public. The study proposed three research questions: 1. Can social media, as an advanced communication channel, help nonprofit organizations to interact with their stakeholders effectively? 2. Do those nonprofit organizations have a strong relationship with their online stakeholders on their social media tools? 3. If so, what kind of strategies do these organizations use to develop and maintain the interactivity with the stakeholders?

To answer these questions, the study conducts a mixed of the quantitative and qualitative method for analyzing nonprofit organizations' social media behaviors. 200 art/humanities/culture nonprofit organizations have been randomly selected from the Charity Navigator first. Then the study observed and collected the data directly from these organizations' Facebook page and Twitter account daily in November 2015. Guided by social capital and social exchange theories, the researcher concentrated on examining whether the frequency of posting or tweeting on the social media platforms, using different types of

strategies and the organization's size could impact on the interaction with from these

organizations' online stakeholders. Inspired by Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) social media

topologies and Lewis et al. (2001) communication models between nonprofit organizations

and their stakeholders, this study developed a coding scheme for the content analysis. The

content analysis helped to give more practical cases and details behind the numerical findings

from the quantitative analysis.

Based on the literature review and the direct observation of the selected organizations'

social media performance, the study categorized three major strategies of how nonprofit

organizations using their social media: 1. Information dissemination; 2. Asking for

participation; 3. Marketing. The study then hypothesized that adopting a different

combination of these strategies could potentially impact on the interaction rate that the

nonprofit organizations received from their online stakeholders.

The results of the analysis indicated that using social media for information

dissemination is still the primary goal for most nonprofit organizations. This is consisting of

previous studies from multiple scholars (Campbell et al., 2014; Guo & Saxton, 2014; Lovejoy

& Saxton, 201; Waters et al., 2009) that nonprofit organizations have not adopt the special

feature of the communication function from their social media platform to engage with their

stakeholders. However, this study thought that even though sometimes the nonprofit

organizations did not build a dialogue on its social media content, it can still earn the

stakeholders' attention and interaction, as long as the content can connect with the

stakeholders' common interests. The study also found out that how frequently a nonprofit organization updated on its social media platform did not influence the stakeholders' interaction rate. In fact, some of the cases shown that overwhelmed and repeated posts and tweets could discourage the public's engagement.

The study also found out that the organization's size (annual revenue) does not influence how the stakeholders interact with on the social media. Smaller nonprofit organizations could still gain a higher interactivity from the online audience. Vice Versa, the bigger nonprofit organization could gain a lower interaction if it did not use the social media wisely. The study suggests that more strategic variables, such as the time spending on the social media, whether the organization is having the personnel support, how long the organization has adopted the social media platforms should be considered in the future research.

Overall, the study concluded that nonprofit organizations need to put more effort into developing its own strategy of using social media to interact with their stakeholders effectively. Organizations should not treat all the social media tools in the same way. A less comprehensive strategy on Twitter could negatively impact on the stakeholders' interaction rate. There are several lessons that this study wants nonprofit practitioners to carry with: 1. there is no one perfect strategy fit all nonprofit organizations; each nonprofit organization should develop its unique strategy blending with its own missions and values. 2. It is necessary to be active enough on social media tools, so that the stakeholders can see you and remember you consistently; however, sending out the repeated information to overwhelmed

your stakeholders could be hurtful on social media; 3. the appropriate and interesting social media content is the key to capture stakeholders' attention and benefit a long term social capital; monitoring the stakeholders' reaction after publishing on the social media platforms could help the organizations to understand and develop a better strategy. In a word, social media offers excitement and potentials to nonprofit organizations. Using this advanced technology strategically would definitely benefit the relationship between nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders.

APPENDIX: THE LIST OF THE ORGANIZATIONS

1. 88Nine Radio Milwaukee

2. Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library & Museum

3. Academy Center of the Arts

4. Actors' Shakespeare Project

5. Actors Theatre of Louisville

6. Albright-Knox Art Gallery

7. Alley Theatre

8. American Swedish Institute

9. American Theatre Wing

10. Art 21

11. Aspen Music Festival and School

12. Austin Symphony Orchestra

13. B&Q Railroad Museum

14. Bankhead Theater

15. Barrington Stage Company

16. Bemis Center for Contemporary Arts

17. Boston Neighborhood Network

18. Bronx Museum of the Arts

19. Brooklyn Museum

20. Bruce Museum

21. Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra

22. Cal Shakes

23. California Historical Society

24. Center Stage

25. Chattanooga History Center

26. Chattanooga Symphony & Opera

27. Cheek wood

28. Chesapeake Bay Maritime Museum

29. Chicago Humanities Festival

30. Chicago Shakespeare Theater

31. Children's Museum of Naples

32. Chorus America

33. City of New York

34. Contemporary Arts Center, New Orleans

35. Contemporary Arts Museum Houston

36. CPBN Audience Care

37. Creede Repertory Theatre

38. Curious Theatre Company

39. Dance/USA

40. Danforth Art

41.   Delaware Museum of Natural History

42.   Detroit Public Television

43.   DuPage Children's Museum

44.   Evansville Museum of Arts, History & Science

45.   Fernbank Museum of Natural History

46.   Figge Art Museum

47.   Fitton Center for Creative Arts

48.   Flynn Center for the Performing Arts

49.   Ford's Theatre

50.   George Washington Masonic Memorial

51.   Georgia O'Keeffe Museum

52.   Grand Rapids Art Museum

53.   Grand Rapids Ballet

54.   Grand Teton Music Festival

55.   Grantmakders in the Arts

56.   Hagley Museum and Library

57.   Hammer Museum

58.   Harlem Stage

59.   Hartford Stage

60.   Heard Museum

61.   Heinz History Center

62.   Henry Art Gallery

63.   High Country News

64.   Hilton Head Symphony Orchestra

65.   Houston Ballet

66.   Houston Symphony

67.   Huntington Museum of Art

68.   Intersection for the Arts

69.   Jazz at Lincoln Center

70.   Jazz St. Louis – Jazz at the Bistro

71.   KCTS 9

72.   Kentucky Museum of Art and Craft

73.   King Arts Complex

74.   Kohl Children's Museum

75.   Korean War National Museum

76.   KUSP

77.   KVIE Public Television

78.   Lake Erie Nature & Science

79.   Lensic Performing Art Center

80.   Liberty Science Center

81.   Lincoln Center Theater

82.   Louisiana Children's Museum

83.   Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra

84.   Lyric Opera of Chicago

85.   Madison Children's Museum

86.   Maine Historical Society

87.   Maine Maritime Museum – Bath, ME

88.   Maryland Symphony Orchestra

89.   MASS MoCA

90.   Minneapolis Institute of Arts

91.   Minnesota Historical Society

92.   Mississippi Children's Museum

93.   MOCA | The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles

94.   Montalvo Arts Center

95.   Museum of the City of New York

96.   Museum of the Shenandoah Valley

97.   Music Theatre Wichita

98.   Nantucket Athenaeum

99.   National Gallery of Art

100.   National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund

101.   National Liberty Museum

102.   National Museum of American Jewish History

103.   National Museum of Wildlife Art

104.   New Bedford Whaling Museum

105.   New England Historic Genealogical Society

106.   New Jersey Symphony Orchestra

107.   New York City Ballet

108.   New York City Center

109.   New York Theatre Workshop

110.   Nine Network

111.   North Dakota Museum of Art

112.   Northeast Indiana Public Radio

113.   Omaha Symphony

114.   Ordway Center for the Performing Arts

115.   Oregon Ballet Theater

116.   Palm Beach Opera

117.   Panhandle – Plains Historical Museum

118.   PBS39, Fort Wayne

119.   PEN American Center

120.   Petersen Automotive Museum

121.   Philadelphia Chamber Music Society

122.   Phoenix Art Museum

123.   Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

124.   Princeton Symphony Orchestra

125.   Reveal

126.   Rhode Island Historical Society

127.   Ridgefield Library

128.   Roosevelt Institute

129.   San Diego Symphony

130.   Santa Barbara Bowl

131.   Science Central

132.   Science Museum of Minnesota

133.   Seattle Art Museum

134.   Seattle Children's Theater

135.   Seattle Men's Chorus – Flying House Productions

136.   Seattle Opera

137.   Seattle Symphony

138.   'SFJAZZ

139.   SFMOMA San Francisco Museum of Modern Art

140.   Shakespeare Theater Company

141. Shubert Theater

142. Silkroad

143. SITE Santa Fe

144. Smuin Ballet

145. Sphinx Organization

146. Spoleto Festival USA

147. The Academy of Natural Sciences

148. The American Prospect

149. The Columbus Museum

150. The Dallas Opera

151. The Dayton Art Institute

152. The Franklin Institute

153. The Glimmerglass Festival

154. The Grand Opera House, Wilmington DE

155. The Heritage Center of the Union League of Philadelphia

156. The High Desert Museum

157. The Hyde Collection

158. The Library Foundation

159. The Library Foundation of Los Angeles

160. The Loft Literary Center

161. The Mark Twain House & Museum

162. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

163. The Metropolitan Opera

164. The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston

165. The New York Pops

166. The Old Globe

167. The Phoenix Symphony

168. The Public Theater

169. The Rose Theater Omaha

170. The Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation, Inc.

171. Theater of a New Audience

172. Thirteen WNET New York

173. Thomas Jefferson's Monticello

174. Thomas Jefferson's Poplar Forest

175. Triad Stage

176. Utah Museum of Contemporary Art

177. Vashon Allied Arts

178. Vero Beach Museum of Art

179. Virginia MOCA

180. VMFA Virginia Museum of Fine Arts

181.   Warner Theater

182.   WCNY

183.   Wellfleet Harbor Actors Theater

184.   WETA

185.   WFUV Public Radio

186.   Wing Luke Museum

187.   Wisconsin Chamber Orchestra

188.   WMHT Educational Telecommunications

189.   WQED Pittsburgh

190.   WRKF-FM 89.3

191.   WSEC-TV/PBS Springfield

192.   WTCI-TV

193.   WTTW Channel 11

194.   WWOZ 90.7 FM New Orleans

195.   WYPR

196.   Richard Nixon Foundation

197.   La Jolla Playhouse

198.   Career Transition for Dancers

199.   The Chicago History Museum

200.   Berkeley Repertory Theater

LIST OF REFERENCE

Alkhafaji, A. F. (1989). *A stakeholder approach to corporate governance: Managing in a dynamic environment* (pp. 103-113). New York: Quorum Books.

Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure altruism and donations to public goods: a theory of warm-glow giving. *The economic journal*, 464-477.

Andreoni, J., & Payne, A. A. (2003). Do government grant to private charities crowd out giving or fund-raising? The American Economic Review, 93(3), 792-812.

Anheier, H. K. (2005). *Nonprofit organizations: theory, management, policy* / Helmut K. Anheier. London; New York: Routledge, 2005.

Ansoff, H. I. (1965). *Corporate strategy*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Arnett, D. B., German, S. D., & Hunt, S. D. (2003). The identity salience model of relationship marketing success: The case of nonprofit marketing. *Journal of marketing*, *67*(2), 89-105.

Balser, D., & McClusky, J. (2005). *Managing stakeholder relationships and nonprofit organization effectiveness*. Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 15(3), 295-315.

Babbie, E. R. (2013). *The Practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, c2013.

Berbers-Lee, T., & Fischetti, M. (2008). *Weaving the Web: The Original Design and Ultimate Destiny of the World Wide Web by Its Inventor*. Paw Prints.

Best, S. J., & Krueger, B. S. (2006). Online interactions and social capital distinguishing between new and existing ties. *Social Science Computer Review*, *24*(4), 395-410.

Bielefeld, W. (1992). Funding uncertainty and nonprofit strategies in the 1980s. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *2*(4), 381-401.

Bickel, R. (2007). *Multilevel analysis for applied research: It's just regression!* Guilford Press.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exhcnage and Power in Social Life.* New York: Wiley

Blau, P. M. (1968). Interaction: social exchange. *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, *7*(2000), 452-458.

Bonsón, E., Torres, L., Royo, S., & Flores, F. (2012). Local e-government 2.0: Social media and corporate transparency in municipalities. *Government information quarterly*, *29*(2), 123-132.

Borgatti, S. P., & Cross, R. (2003). A relational view of information seeking and learning in social networks. *Management science*, *49*(4), 432-445.

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.

Boschken, H. L. (1988). Strategic design and organizational change: Pacific Rim seaports in transition.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. *Handbook of Theory and Research of for the Sociology of Education*.

Boyne, G. A., & Walker, R. M. (2004). Strategy content and public service organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *14*(2), 231-252.

Briones, R. L., Kuch, B., Liu, B. F., & Jin, Y. (2011). Keeping up with the digital age: How the American Red Cross uses social media to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, *37*(1), 37-43.

Brown, W. A., & Iverson, J. O. (2004). Exploring strategy and board structure in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *33*(3), 377-400.

Bruce, I. (1995). Do not-for-profits value their customers and their needs?. *International Marketing Review*, *12*(4), 77-84.

Bryer, T. A. (2007). Negotiating Bureaucratic Responsiveness in Collaboration with Citizens: Findings from Action Research in Los Angeles. ProQuest.

Bryer, T. A. (2011). The costs of democratization. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, *33*(3), 341-361.

Bryson, J. M. (2011). Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement (Vol. 1). John Wiley & Sons.

Burt, R. S., & Knez, M. (1996). Trust and third-party gossip. *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*, *68*, 89.

Campbell, D. A., Lambright, K. T., & Wells, C. J. (2014). Looking for Friends, Fans, and Followers? Social Media Use in Public and Nonprofit Human Services. *Public*

Administration Review.

Carboni, J. L., & Maxwell, S. P. (2015). Effective Social Media Engagement for Nonprofits: What Matters?

Charity Navigator. (2015). *Arts, Culture, Humanities*. Retrieved from: http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.categories&categoryid=2

Christians, C. G., & Johannesen, R. L. (1990). Social responsibility: Ethics and new technologies. *Waveland, Prospect Heights, IL*, 265-278.

Clark, A. F., Maxwell, S. P., & Anestaki, A. (2015). Bach, Beethoven, and benefactors: Facebook engagement between symphonies and their stakeholders. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing.

Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Academic press.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *Am. J. Social*. 94: S95-121.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press.

Cook, K. S., & Rice, E. (2006). Handbook of social psychology: social exchange theory. *University of Wisconsin Madison*.

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of applied psychology*, *78*(1), 98.

Courtney, R. (2002). *Strategic management for nonprofit organizations*. Routledge.

Craig, R. T. (1981). Generalization of Scott's index of intercoder agreement. Public Opinion Quarterly, 45(2), 260-264.

Crittenden, W. F., & Crittenden, V. L. (1997). Strategic planning in third-sector organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 86-103.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 874-900.

Curtis, L., Edwards, C., Fraser, K. L., Gudelsky, S., Holmquist, J., Thornton, K., & Sweetser, K. D. (2010). Adoption of social media for public relations by nonprofit organizations. *Public Relations Review*, *36*(1), 90-92.

Dovey, K., & Onyx, J. (2001). Generating social capital at the workplace: a South African case of inside-out social renewal. *International journal of lifelong education*, *20*(3), 151-168.

Drollinger, T. (2010). A Theoretical Examination of Giving and Volunteering Utilizing Resource Exchange Theory. *Journal Of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *22*(1), 55-66. doi:10.1080/10495140903190416

Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. (2006). Explaining compassion organizing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *51*(1), 59-96.

Eadie, D. C. (1997). *Changing by design: A practical approach to leading innovation in nonprofit organizations*. Jossey-Bass.

Effing, R., van Hillegersberg, J., & Huibers, T. (2011). Social media and political participation: are Facebook, Twitter and YouTube democratizing our political systems? In *Electronic participation* (pp. 25-35). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Ellis, L. (1994). Research methods in the social sciences. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2011). Connection strategies: Social capital implications of Facebook-enabled communication practices. *New Media & Society*, 1461444810385389.

Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual review of sociology*, 335-362.

Evans-Cowley, J., & Hollander, J. (2010). The new generation of public participation: Internet-based participation tools. *Planning, Practice & Research*, *25*(3), 397-408.

Firestone, C. M., & Bollier, D. (2006). WHEN PUSH COMES TO PULL.

Flanagin, A. J., & Metzger, M. J. (2001). Internet use in the contemporary media environment. *Human communication research*, *27*(1), 153-181.

Flannery, H., Harris, R., & Rhine, C. (2009). DonorCentrics™ Internet Giving Benchmarking Analysis. *Target*, *1*.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Perspective (Pitman, Boston, MA).

Gehan, E. A. (1965). A generalized Wilcoxon test for comparing arbitrarily singly-censored samples. *Biometrika*, *52*(1-2), 203-223.

Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. (Eds.). (1976). *Readings in organizations: behavior, structure, processes*. Business Publications.

Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer‑Mediated Communication*, *17*(3), 319-336.

Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations* (Vol. 343). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Grunig, J. E., & White, J. (1989). Public Relations Theory. *New Jersey*.

Guo, C., & Saxton, G. D. (2014). Tweeting social change: How social media are changing nonprofit advocacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 0899764012471585.

Hand, L. C., & Ching, B. D. (2011). " You Have One Friend Request" An Exploration of Power and Citizen Engagement in Local Governments' Use of Social Media. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, *33*(3), 362-382.

Hanson, J. H. (1997). Strategic management and fundraising: a planning model for resource development in the nonprofit organisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *2*(4), 315-323.

Hausmann, A. (2012). Creating 'buzz': opportunities and limitations of social media for arts institutions and their viral marketing. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *17*(3), 173-182.

Heath, R. L. (1994). *Management of corporate communication: From interpersonal contacts to external affairs*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (1999). Theses on nonprofit organizational effectiveness. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *28*(2), 107-126.

Helmig, B., Jegers, M., & Lapsley, I. (2004). Challenges in managing nonprofit organizations: A research overview. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *15*(2), 101-116.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities.

Human, D., & Terblanche, N. S. (2012). Who Receives What? The Influence of the Donation Magnitude and Donation Recipient in Cause-Related Marketing. *Journal Of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *24*(2), 141-160. doi:10.1080/10495142.2012.680317

Hung, C. J. F. (2002). *The interplays of relationship types, relationship cultivation, and*

relationship outcomes: How multinational and Taiwanese companies practice public relations and organization-public relationship management in China (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park).

BM Corp. Released 2013. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 22.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Ingenhoff, D., & Koelling, A. M. (2009). The potential of Web sites as a relationship building tool for charitable fundraising NPOs. *Public Relations Review*, *35*(1), 66-73.

Java, A., Song, X., Finin, T., & Tseng, B. (2007, August). Why we twitter: understanding microblogging usage and communities. In *Proceedings of the 9th WebKDD and 1st SNA-KDD 2007 workshop on Web mining and social network analysis* (pp. 56-65). ACM.

Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict and performance in workgroups. *Administrative science quarterly*, *44*(4), 741-763.

Jennings, M. K., & Zeitner, V. (2003). Internet use and civic engagement: A longitudinal analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *67*(3), 311-334.

Johannesen, R. L., Valde, K. S., & Whedbee, K. E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. Waveland Press.

Jones, T. M., Indexes, S., Register, E. I., & Socially, M. (1980). Corporate social responsibility. *California Management Review*, *22*(2).

Kang, S., & Norton, H. E. (2004). Nonprofit organizations' use of the World Wide Web: are they sufficiently fulfilling organizational goals? *Public Relations Review*, *30*(3), 279-284.

Kanter, B., & Paine, K. D. (2012). *Measuring the Networked Nonprofit: Using Data to Change the World*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business horizons*, *53*(1), 59-68.

Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web. *Public relations review*, *24*(3), 321-334.

Kim, S., & Um, N. H. (2016). Recognition in social media for supporting a cause: Involvement and self-efficacy as moderators. *Social Behavior and*

Personality, *44*(11), 1863-1878.

Kim, Y., & Lee, W. N. (2014). Networking for Philanthropy: Increasing Volunteer Behavior
via Social Networking Sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*,
17(3), 160-165.

King, N. K. (2004). Social capital and nonprofit leaders. *Nonprofit Management and
Leadership*, *14*(4), 471-486.

Knox, S., & Gruar, C. (2007). The application of stakeholder theory to relationship marketing
strategy development in a non-profit organization. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *75*(2),
115-135.

Kotler, P. (1975). Marketing for nonprofit organizations.

Kramer, M. W. (2005). Communication and social exchange processes in community theater
groups. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *33*(2), 159-182.

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W.
(1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and
psychological well-being? *American psychologist*, *53*(9), 1017.

Lambe, C. J., Wittmann, C. M., & Spekman, R. E. (2001). Social exchange theory and
research on business-to-business relational exchange. *Journal of Business-to-Business
Marketing*, *8*(3), 1-36.

Lawler, E. J., & Thye, S. R. (1999). Bringing emotions into social exchange theory. *Annual
review of sociology*, 217-244.

Lawrence Paul, R., & Lorsch Jay, W. (1967). Organization and environment: Managing
differentiation and integration. *Boston, MA: Division of Research, Graduate School of
Business Administration, Harvard Univ*.

Lewis, L. K. (2007). An organizational stakeholder model of change implementation
communication. *Communication Theory*, *17*(2), 176-204.

Lewis, L. K., Hamel, S. A., & Richardson, B. K. (2001). Communicating Change to
Nonprofit Stakeholders Models and Predictors of Implementers' Approaches.
Management Communication Quarterly, *15*(1), 5-41.

List, J. A. (2011). The market for charitable giving. The Journal of Economic Perspectives,
25(2), 157-180.

Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Information, community, and action: how nonprofit

organizations use social media*. *Journal of Computer‑Mediated Communication*, *17*(3), 337-353.

Luther, E. (2005). *How nonprofits use information systems for fundraising: A comparative case study.* (Order No. 3217249, Robert Morris University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses,* 171-171 p. Retrieved from https://login.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/305344254?accountid=10003. (305344254).

Lutz, C., Hoffmann, C. P., & Meckel, M. (2014). Beyond just politics: A systematic literature review of online participation. *First Monday*, *19*(7).

Lietsala, K., & Sirkkunen, E. (2008). Social media. Introduction to the tools and processes of participatory economy.

Massarsky, C., & Beinhacker, S. (2002). Enterprising Nonprofits: Revenue Generation in the Nonprofit Sector. *Yale School of Management–The Goldman Sachs Foundation Partnership on Nonprofit Ventures*.

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach: An interactive approach*. Sage.

McHatton, P. A., Bradshaw, W., Gallagher, P. A., & Reeves, R. (2011). Results from a strategic planning process: Benefits for a nonprofit organization. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *22*(2), 233-249.

Meier, K. J., O'Toole, L. J., Boyne, G. A., & Walker, R. M. (2007). Strategic management and the performance of public organizations: Testing venerable ideas against recent theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *17*(3), 357-377.

Mergel, I. (2012). *Social media in the public sector: A guide to participation, collaboration and transparency in the networked world*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mergel, I., & Bretschneider, S. I. (2013). A three-stage adoption process for social media use in government. *Public Administration Review*, *73*(3), 390-400.

Messner, M., Jin, Y., Medina-Messner, V., Meganck, S., Quarforth, S. C., & Norton, S. K. (2013). 140 characters for better health: An exploration of the twitter engagement of leading nonprofit organizations. In *Social Media and Strategie Communications* (pp. 119-136). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Miles, R. E., Snow, C. C., Meyer, A. D., & Coleman, H. J. (1978). Organizational strategy, structure, and process. *Academy of management review*, *3*(3), 546-562.

Miller, B. (2009). Community fundraising 2.0—the future of fundraising in a networked society?. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *14*(4), 365-370.

Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The rise and fall of strategic planning: Reconceiving roles for planning, plans, planners* (Vol. 458). New York: Free Press.

Molm, L. D., Takahashi, N., & Peterson, G. (2000). Risk and trust in social exchange: An experimental test of a classical proposition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1396-1427.

Monge, P. R., & Contractor, N., S. (2003). *Theories of communication networks*: Oxford University Press.

Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *the journal of marketing*, 20-38.

Mort, G. S., Weerawardena, J., & Williamson, B. (2007). Branding in the non-profit context: the case of Surf Life Saving Australia. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, *15*(2), 108-119.

Mottner, S., & Ford, J. B. (2005). Measuring nonprofit marketing strategy performance: the case of museum stores. *Journal of Business Research*, *58*(6), 829-840.

Muralidharan, S., Rasmussen, L., Patterson, D., & Shin, J. H. (2011). Hope for Haiti: An analysis of Facebook and Twitter usage during the earthquake relief efforts. *Public Relations Review*, *37*(2), 175-177.

Naaman, M., Boase, J., & Lai, C. H. (2010, February). Is it really about me?: message content in social awareness streams. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work* (pp. 189-192). ACM.

Nah, S. (2009). Building social capital through nonprofit organizations' websites: Organizational features and e-social capital. *AEJMC, Boston, MA*.

Nie, N. H., & Erbring, L. (2000). Internet and society. *Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society*.

Nonprofit Technology Network. (2014). The 2014 Nonprofit Benchmarks Study. Retrieved from http://www.nten.org/research/benchmarks

Ohana, M., Meyer, M., & Swaton, S. (2013). Decision-Making in Social Enterprises: Exploring the Link Between Employee Participation and Organizational

Commitment. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *42*(6), 1092-1110. doi:10.1177/0899764012451368

O'reilly, T. (2007). What is Web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. *Communications and Strategies*, *65*(1), 17-37.

Park, H., & Reber, B. H. (2008). Relationship building and the use of Web sites: How Fortune 500 corporations use their Web sites to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, *34*(4), 409-411.

Perrow, C. (1967). A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. *American sociological review*, 194-208.

Pénard, T., & Poussing, N. (2010). Internet use and social capital: The strength of virtual ties. *Journal of Economic Issues*, *44*(3), 569-595.

Pew Research Center. (2016). Social Media Update 2016. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/11/11/social-media-update-2016/

Portes, A. (2000). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *LESSER, Eric L. Knowledge and Social Capital. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann*, 43-67.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster.

Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management science*, *29*(3), 363-377.

Rainey, H. G. (2009). *Understanding and managing public organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.

Reddick, C., G, & Ponomariov, B. (2012). *The effect of individual's organization affiliation on their internet donations*. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.

Reddy, R. D. (1980). Individual philanthropy and giving behavior. *Participation in social and political activities*, 370-399.

Roe, J. A. (2014). Donor perceived relationships with nonprofits using social media: A quantitative correlational study. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, *74*.

Roloff, M. E. (1981). *Interpersonal communication: The social exchange approach*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Rupp, C., Kern, S., & Helmig, B. (2014). Segmenting nonprofit stakeholders to enable successful relationship marketing: a review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *19*(2), 76-91.

Rybalko, S., & Seltzer, T. (2010). Dialogic communication in 140 characters or less: How Fortune 500 companies engage stakeholders using Twitter. *Public Relations Review*, *36*(4), 336-341.

Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., & Sturza, D. (1999). America's nonprofit sector: A primer (Vol. 10). New York: Foundation Center.

Saxton, G. D., & Benson, M. A. (2005). Social capital and the growth of the nonprofit sector*. *Social Science Quarterly*, *86*(1), 16-35.

Saxton, G. D., & Wang, L. (2013). The social network effect: The determinants of giving through social media. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 0899764013485159.

Saxton, G. D., & Waters, R. D. (2014). What do Stakeholders Like on Facebook? Examining Public Reactions to Nonprofit Organizations' Informational, Promotional, and Community-Building Messages. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *26*(3), 280-299.

Saxton, J. (2001). The growth of the Internet, digital television and mobile telephony and the implications for not‐for‐profit marketing. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *6*(4), 347-363.

Schneider, J. (2009). *Organizational social capital and nonprofits*. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 38(4), 643-662.

Schwartz, E. (1996). *Netactivism: How citizens use the Internet*. Songline Studios, Inc., 101 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

Scott, C. R., & Timmerman, C. E. (2005). Relating computer, communication, and computer-mediated communication apprehensions to new communication technology use in the workplace. *Communication Research*, *32*(6), 683-725.

Serpe, R. T. (1987). Stability and change in self: A structural symbolic interactionist explanation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44-55.

Shumate, M., & O'Connor, A. (2010). The symbiotic sustainability model: Conceptualizing NGO–corporate alliance communication. *Journal of Communication*, *60*(3), 577-609.

Shier, M. L., & Handy, F. (2012). Understanding online donor behavior: the role of donor

characteristics, perceptions of the internet, website and program, and influence from social networks. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *17*(3), 219-230.

Siciliano, J. I. (1997). The Relationship between Formal Planning and Performance in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *7*(4), 387-403.

Smith, A. N., Fischer, E., & Yongjian, C. (2012). How does brand-related user-generated content differ across YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *26*(2), 102-113.

Smith, L. J., & Friedman, M. L. (1994). Measuring satisfaction with services when the customer is not the consumer: The child care service example. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *2*(1), 9-28.

Smitko, K. (2012). Donor engagement through Twitter. *Public Relations Review*, *38*(4), 633-635.

Sproull, L., & Kiesler, S. (1991). Connections: new ways of working in the networked organization.

Steinberg, R. (2003). Economic theories of nonprofit organizations. *In The study of the nonprofit enterprise* (pp. 277-309). Springer US.

Steiner, G. A. (1963). *The people look at television: A study of audience attitudes*. Knopf.

Swanson, L. A. (2013). A Strategic Engagement Framework for Nonprofits. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *23*(3), 303-323.

Sweetser, K. D., Porter, L. V., Chung, D. S., & Kim, E. (2008). Credibility and the use of blogs among professionals in the communication industry. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *85*(1), 169-185.

Taylor, M., Kent, M. L., & White, W. J. (2001). How activist organizations are using the Internet to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, *27*(3), 263-284.

Thompson, J. D. (2011). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory* (Vol. 1). Transaction Publishers.

Thompson, J. K., Wartick, S. L., & Smith, H. L. (1991). Integrating corporate social performance and stakeholder management: Implications for a research agenda in small business. *Research in corporate social performance and policy*, *12*(1), 207-230.

Timmerman, C. E. (2003). Media Selection During the Implementation of Planned

Organizational Change a Predictive Framework Based on Implementation Approach and Phase. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *16*(3), 301-340.

Tredinnick, L. (2006). Web 2.0 and Business A pointer to the intranets of the future? *Business information review*, *23*(4), 228-234.

Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *Academy of management Journal*, *41*(4), 464-476.

Tschirhart, M. (1996). *Artful leadership: Managing stakeholder problems in nonprofit arts organizations*. Indiana University Press.

Tschirhart, M., & Bielefeld, W. (2012). *Managing nonprofit organizations*. Wiley.

Van Til, J. (2005). Nonprofit organizations and social institutions. *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership & Management (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass*.

Varadarajan, P. R., & Menon, A. (1988). Cause-related marketing: A coalignment of marketing strategy and corporate philanthropy. *The Journal of Marketing*, 58-74.

Vicente, E., Camarero, C., & Garrido, M. J. (2012). Insights into Innovation in European Museums: The impact of cultural policy and museum characteristics. *Public Management Review*, *14*(5), 649-679.

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*(2), 102-106. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.006

Waters, R. D., & Feneley, K. L. (2013). Virtual stewardship in the age of new media: have nonprofit organizations' moved beyond Web 1.0 strategies? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *18*(3), 216-230.

Waters, Richard D., and Jia Y. Jamal. "Tweet, tweet, tweet: A content analysis of nonprofit organizations' Twitter updates." *Public Relations Review* 37, no. 3 (2011): 321-324.

Yang, K. & Miller, G.J. (2008). Handbook of research methods in public administration (2nd edition). New York: M. Dekker.

Young, D. R., & Steinberg, R. (1995). *Economics for nonprofit managers*. New York: Foundation Center.