Promotional Communication and Campus Ministries:

Branding Religion in the Digital Age

by

Madison Williams

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

Communication

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2017, Madison Williams

Abstract

The contemporary media environment is dominated by promotional culture, a force which has captured not only commercial brands, but non-profit ones too. This thesis examines how four Christian campus ministries in Canada (Power to Change – Students, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, The Navigators, and Catholic Christian Outreach) use Facebook to market their ‘brands’, recruit potential adherents and mobilize supporters to the Gospel. Drawing on the work of Peters (1999, 2006) it asks critical questions about the benefits of dialogue and dissemination, explores how these principles are implemented in social media environments, and considers the benefits and limitations for faith-based non-profit organizations. The study finds that campus ministries use some dialogic principles in their posts and interactions with users online, meeting certain prerequisites for dialogic communication. Yet it also shows that dissemination can be valuable for organizations that need to connect with audiences and compete with established brands in what is increasingly an ad-saturated mediascape. The study contributes to a broad range of scholarship, including literature on promotional culture, media and religion, non-profit communication, and social media.

Acknowledgements

I thank my committee, department, family, and more for all their help and commitment to my research.

To my committee of Dr. Joshua Greenberg and Dr. Liam Cole Young: thank you for your time, suggestions, and sharing your expertise to produce this research project. Many other professors and faculty in the department have also been helpful in gathering resources and forming this research design. I also thank my peers in the MA and PhD Communication program for their assistance, encouragement and support.

To my family and close friends: thank you for your many months of listening to me share about my thesis progress, and reminding me of this project's importance. Your love and personal support got me to where I am today.

To the campus ministry staff in Power to Change – Students, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, The Navigators, and Catholic Christian Outreach: thank you for the work that you do in reaching college and university students with the Gospel.

Finally, I would like to thank God for what He has done in my life and bringing me to research campus ministries in Canada, giving me a passion to explore digital media use for these campus ministries, and giving me the strength to finish this entire project and Master's degree.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures.....	ix
List of Appendices.....	xi
1 Chapter: Introduction: The Promotional Non-Profit	1
1.1 Background and Importance of Study	1
1.2 Methodology.....	5
1.3 Organization of Remaining Chapters	11
2 Chapter: Introduction to Campus Ministries	14
2.1 Understanding Campus Ministries	14
2.2 History of P2C-S, IVCF, Navigators, and CCO.....	18
2.3 Campus Ministries as Non-Profits.....	23
3 Chapter: Literature Review: Non-Profits, Promotional Culture, (Digital) Media, Religion, and Dialogic Communication	26
3.1 Marketing Better: For-Profit and Non-Profit Alike.....	26
3.1.1 Defining Marketing.....	26
3.1.2 For-Profit and Non-Profit Marketing Literature	27
3.2 Promotional Culture and Advertising in Critical Communication Studies	29
3.2.1 Advertising and Branding	29
3.2.2 Promotional Culture	30
3.2.3 Promotional Culture in the Digital Era	31
3.3 Digital Technologies and Social Media.....	34

3.3.1	Defining and Understanding Media and Technology	34
3.3.2	Development and Characteristics of Web 2.0	36
3.3.3	Social Media.....	38
3.3.4	Advertising Online	40
3.3.5	Critical Perspectives of the Internet and Social Media	42
3.4	Religion Plus Media: Ethical Questions of Use from Print to the Internet.....	48
3.4.1	Religion and Media	48
3.4.2	Religion and the Internet.....	49
3.4.3	Christian Perspectives: A Theology of Technology.....	51
3.5	Dialogic Communication.....	54
3.5.1	Dialogue	54
3.5.2	Dialogue vs. Dissemination (Socrates vs. Jesus)	57
3.5.3	Dialogic Communication in Public Relations	61
3.5.4	Dialogic Communication in Research.....	69
3.6	Addressing the Gap in the Literature.....	72
4	Chapter: Methodology: Analysing Dialogic Communication on Facebook Pages	74
4.1	Approach and Methodology	74
4.2	Rationale for Sample Selection	77
4.3	Rationale for Facebook Pages	78
4.4	Criteria for Each Dialogic Principle on Social Media	80
4.4.1	Criteria Used for the Dialogic Loop Principle	81
4.4.2	Criteria Used for the Usefulness of Information Principle.....	82
4.4.3	Criteria Used for the Generation of Return Visits Principle	85
4.4.4	Criteria Used for the Conservation of Visitors Principle	86
4.5	Criteria for Dialogic Interaction in Comments	87

4.5.1	Criteria Used for Information Exchange	88
4.5.2	Criteria Used for the Engaging Conversation	89
4.6	Coding Procedures.....	90
4.7	Researcher Standpoint and Perspective	92
5	Chapter: Results and Discussion: Campus Ministries Caught in Promotional Culture	94
5.1	Results	94
5.1.1	Results for the Four Dialogic Principles	95
5.1.2	Results for Dialogic Interaction in Comments	106
5.2	Discussion.....	113
5.2.1	Discussion for the Four Dialogic Principles	113
5.2.2	Discussion for the Dialogic Interaction in Comments	121
5.2.3	Facebook, Dialogue and Promotional Culture	124
6	Chapter: Conclusions	131
6.1	Limitations of the Study	131
6.2	Recommendations for Future Research.....	134
6.3	Conclusions	136
	Appendices.....	143
	Appendix A Criteria for Dialogic Principles	143
A.1	Examples of Criteria for the Dialogic Loop Principle	143
A.2	Examples of Criteria for Usefulness of Information Principle.....	144
A.3	Examples of Criteria for Generation of Return Visits Principle	146
A.4	Examples of Criteria for Conservation of Visitors Principle	148
	Appendix B Criteria for Dialogic Interaction in Comments	149
B.1	Examples of Criteria for Information Exchange in Comments.....	149
B.2	Examples of Criteria for Engaging Conversation in Comments	150

Appendix C Campus Ministry's Facebook Page URL's	151
Bibliography	152

List of Tables

Table 1 Examples of Criteria for Dialogic Loop Principle.....	82
Table 2 Examples of Criteria for Usefulness of Information Principle	84
Table 3 Examples of Criteria for Generation of Return Visits Principle.....	86
Table 4 Examples of Criteria for the Conservation of Visitors Principle.....	87
Table 5 Examples of Criteria for Information Exchange in Comments	89
Table 6 Examples of Criteria for Engaging Conversation in Comments	90

List of Figures

Figure 1 Percent of Dialogic Principles Used in Total Facebook Posts	95
Figure 2 Criteria for Dialogic Principles Appearance as Percentage within Total Posts .	96
Figure 3 Number of Dialogic Principles Used Per Post	97
Figure 4 Criteria for Dialogic Principles Appearing as Percentage within Each Principle	98
Figure 5 Percentage of Criteria Used in Dialogic Loop	99
Figure 6 Percentage of Criteria Used in Usefulness of Information.....	99
Figure 7 Percentage of Criteria Used in Generation of Return Visits	100
Figure 8 Percentage of Criteria Used in Conservation of Visitors	101
Figure 9 Percentage of Dialogic Principles Used in Total Posts Across Campus Ministries	102
Figure 10 Percentage of Criteria Used in Dialogic Loop Across Campus Ministries	103
Figure 11 Percentage of Criteria Used in Usefulness of Information Across Campus Ministries	104
Figure 12 Percentage of Criteria Used in Generation of Return Visits Across Campus Ministries	105
Figure 13 Percentage of Criteria Used in Conservation of Visitors Across Campus Ministries	106
Figure 14 Percent of Comments Appearing in Total Number of Posts	107
Figure 15 Percentage of Each Form of Dialogic Interaction Appearing in All Comments	108

Figure 16 Criteria for Dialogic Interaction Appearance as Percentage Within Total	
Comments	108
Figure 17 Number of Criteria Appearing in Comment Sections of Posts with Comments	
.....	109
Figure 18 Criteria Appearing as Percentage Within Each Form of Dialogic Interaction	110
Figure 19 Percentage of Criteria Used in Information Exchange Across Campus	
Ministries	111
Figure 20 Percentage of Criteria Used in Engaging Conversation Across Campus	
Ministries	112
Figure 21 Percentage of Each Form of Dialogic Interaction Appearing Across Campus	
Ministries	113

List of Appendices

Appendix A Criteria for Dialogic Principles.....	143
A.1 Examples of Criteria for the Dialogic Loop Principle.....	143
A.2 Examples of Criteria for the Usefulness of Information Principle.....	144
A.3 Examples of Criteria for the Generation of Return Visits Principle.....	146
A.4 Examples of Criteria for the Conservation of Visitors Principle.....	148
Appendix B Criteria for Dialogic Interaction in Comments.....	149
B.1 Examples of Criteria for Information Exchange in Comments.....	149
B.2 Examples of Criteria for Engaging Conversation in Comments.....	150
Appendix C Campus Ministry’s Facebook Page URL’s.....	151

1 Chapter: Introduction: The Promotional Non-Profit

1.1 Background and Importance of Study

Join us! Register today! Apply now! Buy this!

The pitches and invitations from companies are seen and heard in nearly every media form today. We see a poster in the local grocery store about a new gym that just opened: *join us!* We hear on the radio about an upcoming conference for people working in your field: *register today!* We scroll through our Facebook News Feed and see a sponsored ad for job openings in our city: *apply now!* We walk through the mall and notice a store-wide sale: *buy this!*

These invitations attempt to sell audiences on something – to join, to go, to try, or to buy. They use tactics and appeals of traditional advertising and marketing, but sometimes these methods are expanded to new media forms on the Internet, including social networking sites. We assume that these strategies are used in the private sector where consumers and viewers are seen as an audience to be convinced to act in a certain way and make a purchase. And yet, non-profit organizations are adopting similar strategies and appeals. They too use the same phrases and language to call people to join, register, apply (and even “buy,” on some occasions) the things provided by the non-profit organization. *Join us:* a community that cares about social issues. *Register today:* for our next fundraising dinner. *Apply now:* be a member of our dedicated, passionate team. *Buy this:* show your support of our corporate partners.

Promotional messages like these sneak into our daily mix of media consumption, in both traditional media (radio, television, print) and new media forms (websites, Facebook, Twitter, blogs). Some people may not easily make a distinction on the source

of these messages (from for-profit or non-profit organizations), but in both cases, audiences recognize they are being “sold” something, whether that is a product, an identity or an attitude.

Non-profit organizations are also players in the promotional game, seeking to use persuasive messaging to advance the benevolent nature of their mission. Yet, one should ask, in doing so are they just adding to the noise of our promotionally saturated media environment? To the extent that non-profits promote their good deeds and initiatives, do they do so in the same ways as for-profits, particularly in online spaces? What are the implications for non-profits that borrow the promotional strategies of for-profit actors?

There are both opportunities and risks for non-profit organizations to copy the promotional approaches of private industry. While these methods of reaching audiences may be done with the best intentions, the underlying logic of for-profit marketing can devalue and reduce a non-profit’s ‘conscience constituents’ (direct supporters who benefit from the organization’s goals and accomplishments) to another audience to be targeted (McCarthy & Zald, 1977)¹. Here, strategies are used such as grouping together individuals into an audience, finding the best way to reach them, using emotional appeals verging on manipulation, and measuring success by numbers. Reaching current and potential members, donors, and stakeholders for the non-profit can seem more instrumental in this way, instead of relational.

¹ The term ‘conscience constituents’ comes from social movement theory, and although there are differences between social movements and the non-profit organizations considered in this thesis, the term can similarly be applied. Co-founder of CCO, André Reniger, uses the term “movement” in an introductory video to their ministry (“Who we are,” CCO). However, National Director of P2C-S does not like calling the ministry itself a “movement”, stating: “We aren’t a movement by ourselves, but we are certainly part of one” (Cullen, 2016b).

This study examines how Christian campus ministries in Canada are using social media to construct a branded image, and to build relationships and dialogue with their followers, supporters and mission adherents. It asks: What style(s) of communication do campus ministries use on their Facebook Pages: one-way/instrumental or two-way/dialogic? The four “general interest” Christian campus ministries in Canada were selected for this project: Power to Change – Students (P2C-S), Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF), The Navigators, and Catholic Christian Outreach (CCO). This thesis examined these non-profits’ Facebook Pages in relation to four of Kent and Taylor’s (1998) dialogic principles: dialogic loop, usefulness of information, generation of return visits, and conservation of visitors.

The chosen modes of address and communication tactics used by these campus ministries matters, as students can discover groups like campus ministries through social media. College and university students go online to get information about what interests them, to connect with friends, and perhaps to connect with organizations. They may search on Google, browse their school’s student union website, or look on Facebook for groups that suit their interests. These campus ministries can use certain language and interact with online visitors in ways that reveal what kind of organization they are. They could appear to be just like any other brand vying for audience attention to buy into something, or they could offer something distinctly different and make the visitor feel cared for as an individual, rather than part of some mass audience. Students involved in the ministry may have one experience in person (that they are personally valued) and a completely different one in online contexts (that they are being “sold” something). This kind of mixed messaging can put the non-profit in a negative light for its online visitors.

This project is also interested in what dialogic engagement is considered. It questions if any form of dialogue (two-way communication) will necessarily contribute to developing a relationship between organization and publics (interested audiences, members, or other stakeholders). I question: Is dialogue inherently “better” than dissemination? Could organizations use both dialogic and dissemination strategies simultaneously for different purposes? Generally, what constitutes dialogue? Is it mere interaction and having systems in place for dialogic communication to happen, or is the content of the interaction equally important? These questions are explored by looking at the content of comment sections on the organization’s Facebook posts.

After examining how these faith-based non-profits communicate with their audiences on social media, I argue that these organizations should carefully consider the implications of using promotional communication for building support and engendering mobilization (i.e., how it transforms their flock into a group to speak *to* rather than speak *with*). At the same time, they should also consider how dissemination can be valued and useful in their communication plans, rather than solely dialogue. No doubt, digital media provide an efficient and cost-effective way at reaching young people who are interested in the Gospel or meeting with other Christians on their campus. Online advertising may very well ‘work’ at motivating attitude and behavioural changes, but just because it has proven effective does not mean organizations should proceed without consideration of its ethical consequences. Do non-profits start looking like for-profits when users see posts with “join us!” or “apply now!” in their Facebook News Feeds? Those working for a non-profit organization should reflect on how these online channels are utilized. The modes of address found on their social media pages can either spark engaging conversation with

their followers, or work to better market the campus ministry as a brand, positioning both the organization and its followers in distinct ways – one form of communication is focused on meaningful relationship building, and the other on how the organization’s image will be perceived.

1.2 Methodology

This project explores how Facebook Pages are used by four Christian campus ministries in Canada: P2C-S, IVCF, The Navigators, and CCO. All four faith-based non-profit organizations are categorized as “Christian” with the first three falling under the umbrella of Protestant evangelical Christianity, and the fourth Roman Catholic. Each group seeks to connect with students on college or university campuses, to teach them of a saving faith in Jesus, and how to live out the Christian life. They all carry out three activities of campus ministries: evangelism, disciple-making and mission mobilization (Tolliston, 2015). Each ministry has a distinct mission and vision, but overall these ministries operate in a similar fashion with some shared goals. This thesis examines how these organizations use social media to support student outreach and mobilization efforts.

To explore how these campus ministries connect with students online, I conducted a content analysis of their Facebook posts and comment sections. Facebook was chosen as the social media channel to analyze, first, because of how the selected campus ministries use social media: all four organizations have a Facebook Page, but they are not equally using other social media channels like Twitter, Instagram, or YouTube. Facebook is built for users to grow their social networks online, with its current tagline “Connect with friends and the world around you on Facebook” displayed on the sign-in page. Its mission is “to give people the power to share and make the world more open and connected”

(“About”, Facebook). Facebook is the dominant social media platform: by September 2016, there were 1.79 billion monthly active Facebook users (“Company info”). Compared to other social networking sites, Facebook is the most popular today: 79% of Americans use Facebook, compared to 24% on Twitter and 32% on Instagram (Greenwood, Perrin, & Duggan, 2016). Because of its dominance, Facebook is important for marketers in both for-profit and non-profit sectors, as some organizations have shifted their advertising efforts to Facebook because they receive more traffic there than on their website (Neff, 2010). Since social networking sites encourage making connections with other users, it is understandable that organizations could use Facebook for dialogic, back-and-forth conversation and communication.

Organizations can, with no upfront cost, create a Page on Facebook to act as the face of the organization on the social media platform. When getting started, the Page’s creator is required to select a category, then prompted to add some information (a profile picture, cover photo, short description, link to website, and call-to-action button). All of the tabs are already created (home, events, reviews, about, photos, videos, posts, likes, notes, services, and shop), but can be rearranged and added or removed. Facebook also includes some specialized settings (similar Page suggestions, selecting a preferred Page audience, connecting to an Instagram account for advertising) as well as insights (on Page views, Page likes, post reach, and post engagements). The administrator of the Page can edit these settings, create posts, update their information and photos, and respond to users’ comments and messages. Non-profits will use Facebook Pages as it is a cost-effective strategy to disseminate information and communicate with interested audiences (members, supporters, or other stakeholders) online. There is increasing pressure for

organizations to have an online presence as it impacts the organization's image and reputation: "the social media profile of an organization is a function that affects the whole organization" (Sévigny & Flynn, 2011).

There are, however, some limitations in how Facebook can be used, and supposed positive qualities of social media and the Internet that can be challenged. Because of its many-to-many distribution structure, "the internet has long been celebrated for its potential to overcome the asymmetries of top-down broadcast media – and even representative democracy itself" (Lovink, 2011, p. 1). However, similar to mass media, today "powerful media and corporate elites still have the ability and resources to control the channels and technology of communication" (Sévigny & Flynn, 2011, p. 4). This is evident through a number of factors: how algorithms (complex computational processes used to make decisions) serve a gatekeeping and filtering role on search engines and social media sites like Facebook (Tufekci, 2012), how big data is collected from users' digital paths for marketers to personally target their ads (Couldry & Turow, 2014), and the political economy of the Internet that reveals how a few powerful players (i.e., Google and Facebook) maintain control (McChesney, 2014; van Dijck, 2012). All of these factors do not work in the interests of the people, everyday users, who believed in the Internet's promise for more collaboration, participation and democracy.

Depending on the way a user behaves online, certain content will appear for them in their News Feed, restricting what content surfaces for individual users and thus their potential online engagement. Facebook helps manage the flow of information on the social network through algorithmic curation that decides which posts to display or hide (Tufekci, 2016). These algorithms may bypass posts by organizations that users care

about if their previous online activity suggests otherwise. This limits how everyday users are exposed to and able to interact with posts made by organizations on sites like Facebook. It restricts potential opportunity for people to discover campus ministries if they have not yet shown any interest in other Christian groups, Pages, events, or content online. The algorithm learns the user's preferences from their previous "searches, status updates, uploads, purchases, and browsing habits" (Brown, 2013, p. 391) which influences what recommendations or ads appear, filtering out what is expected to be irrelevant or undesirable for that specific user to see.

Additionally, although there is some potential in using social media for back-and-forth dialogue, some organizations may treat their social media pages as traditional one-way communication channels that disseminate static information, similar to other digital media that are less interactive such as websites, emails, or online newsletters (Keller, 2013; Olsson & Eriksson, 2016). In this way, it is not just the design of the website (i.e., what is visible for a user vs. an administrator, algorithmic filtering, etc.) that limits how Facebook Pages are used, but also those managing the Page who understand how the platform operates differently than other communication channels. Everyday users and communications managers should better understand what exists behind the Internet, the devices they use, and the social networking sites they spend so much time on, including: the owners of major web browsers and social networking sites, the surveillance and monetization of our online actions that assist marketers, and the use of algorithms to decide what information is most valuable and visible to users.

In this content analysis, I focused in particular on the campus ministries' appeals or styles of address, considering whether they were more one-way/instrumental or two-

way/dialogic in how they communicate. By exploring the social media use of these organizations, I hope to open up a discussion around the tensions that can be found in non-profit promotional communication. These groups do not exist to build financial power, but to increase their base of members and supporters, and to further the mission of their organization. To reach new members who do not know the organization requires some form of persuasive communication, which in turn requires conceptualizing followers as an audience to be segmented and targeted.

My research suggests that the modes of address that non-profit organizations use on their Facebook Pages to engage with these audiences signals if they are aiming to disseminate information as an instrumental one-way broadcast, or seeking to build relationships through dialogic, two-way communication. Public relations models advocate for dialogic communication, as it is key for organizations to build relationships with their publics (Grunig, 1989; Grunig, 1992). Dialogue and conversation are important for managing stakeholder (audience, customer, member) relations, especially ones that are mutually beneficial for the organization and public (Kent & Taylor, 2002).

As well as exploring the use of dialogic principles in the organizations' posts on Facebook, this study also begins to challenge the nature of dialogue itself. In this project, I further question if and how dialogue is valued more highly than dissemination in public relations (or if they can both be utilized, but serve different purposes). I also interrogate what meaningful dialogue between organization and public looks like by asking if simple information exchange is enough, or if it must be a more meaningful engagement to build the relationships that public relations aims to establish and maintain.

This research will contribute to the current knowledge and work on promotional communication, marketing, and public relations. Literature on critical studies of promotional culture has continued to expand since Wernick's original work in 1991, and this research builds on these contemporary examples, contexts, and media environments by focusing on a unique example (Canadian campus ministries). Although the practice of public relations is not new, empirical research on public relations in Canada has only emerged in the past few decades, as Flynn & Sévigny (2009) state "the Canadian critical literature on public relations has been sparse" (p. 9). Because of this, "the field of public relations and communications management is ripe for scholarship and study" (Flynn & Sévigny, 2009, p. 8). Research on dialogic communication has also expanded to include analyzing organizations' online communication (websites and social media). This study adds to these efforts, especially those that research non-profit organizations.

The current study also contributes to the literature that addresses intersections between media and religion, particularly Internet Studies and religion. Although these campus ministries are not seeking to create entire online religious communities², these connections are still important to consider when exploring the nature of these non-profits as religious clubs. It is also essential to understand how Christians regard using media and advertising for evangelistic or missional purposes to further spread the Gospel and reach more people. These campus ministries can seek to engage with their audiences on social media by being good stewards of this technology, ultimately to further the vision and mission of their organization.

² A distinction between "online religion" and "religion online" is made by Hadden & Cowan (2000), mentioned in the literature review. Campus ministries do not use social media for users to participate in religious ritual or practice online ("online religion").

The findings of this study will be useful for any faith-based campus club, and can also applied to other ministries or religious groups that seek to connect with the post-secondary student demographic online. This study is especially applicable for non-profits who have embraced the available digital technology and are seeking to use its potential for organizational purposes. They can evaluate the extent to which they are making beneficial use of public relations techniques in online spaces to build relationships with their diverse audiences. They may also reflect on how dissemination may be valued and used in their communication online. The interrelated elements of this thesis explain the current situation of marketers in the religious sector of non-profit organizations, which can be helpful for organizations belonging to other religious affiliations as well.

1.3 Organization of Remaining Chapters

In Chapter 2, I describe the goals and work of Christian campus ministries, then focus more closely on the specific campus ministries under analysis. I provide further historical background on the four groups being analyzed: Power to Change – Students, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, The Navigators, and Catholic Christian Outreach. I draw similarities across them in terms of vision, history, scope, and regular activities. I also point to a few recent issues in relation to Christianity and the student demographic: the trend of young adults who grew up in the church leaving their faith, and the “image problem” that Christianity has in North America.

Chapter 3 offers a review of key literature. I start by noting how the orientation of much non-profit marketing literature is considered with instrumental questions (i.e., “how to do it better”). I then introduce ‘promotional culture’ as a guiding critical concept, describing its place in the contemporary media environment. I draw out the developments

in the Internet and social media, noting some critical questions and perspectives. I also position my project in the broader context of religion and media studies, tracing the ways “religion” and “media” can be understood together, and recent advances in the field of religion and Internet studies. I also present a “theology of technology” from a Christian perspective that raises ethical questions of media use for evangelistic purposes. Also included here is a discussion of dialogic communication, how dialogue is understood as the opposite of dissemination, and how public relations models advocate using dialogic principles. In this section, I indicate the gap in the current literature linking these areas together for the specific object under study (Christian campus ministries in Canada) and the need for more critical perspectives on non-profit marketing.

In Chapter 4, I analyze the online presence of the four campus-based non-profits, considering previous research of non-profit dialogic communication online. I look to each organization’s national Facebook Pages, analyzing the content of the organizations’ posts and comments made by Page visitors. I conducted a content analysis for five months to explore if these groups engage in dialogic communication with their audience to build relationships, or if the posts are more promotionally oriented and instrumental.

In Chapter 5, I discuss research findings and the implications for the campus ministries under study, reviewing how these non-profit organizations make use of some dialogic principles on their social media Pages to engage with their audiences online. It is in this chapter where I address how faith-based non-profits like these fit in the media landscape, seemingly caught in the logic and trap of promotional culture.

In the final chapter I conclude my project and review the ways campus ministries use their Facebook Pages for both one-way/instrumental and two-way/dialogic

communication. Here the discussion continues on how dialogic communication is highly valued in public relations practice, and where campus ministries may use both dialogue and dissemination in communicating with their audiences online. I ask questions from my findings that could not be answered because of space restrictions, to open up opportunities for future projects and continue conversations around Christian young adult ministries and social media. I end by providing suggestions on how online communication plans should consider both the benefits and limits of social media, and can value dissemination rather than just dialogue.

2 Chapter: Introduction to Campus Ministries

2.1 Understanding Campus Ministries

Christians believe in Jesus Christ and his teachings; they are followers of Christ (Schultze & Woods, 2008). They treat the Gospel (the “good news” of Jesus’ perfect life, substitutionary death and resurrection that reconciles sinners to God) as a message to spread to others (Strider, 2012). Sharing the Gospel is a core concept for Christians because of the Great Commission, Jesus’ last words and final instruction to his disciples (and any future followers of Jesus). In Matthew 28:18-20 Jesus tells them: “go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you” (English Standard Version).

Many Christian campus ministries are founded on and motivated by the Great Commission. Three elements of the Great Commission that are seen in campus ministry models are: evangelism (leading people to Christ), disciple-making (building people in Christ), and mission mobilization (sending people to the nations) (Tolliston, 2015). The Great Commission cycle “begins with evangelism, continues with disciple-making and ends with mission mobilization only to begin again with more evangelism” (Tolliston, 2015). Through these elements, campus ministries focus on three related activities: explaining the Gospel, examining the Gospel, and exporting the Gospel (Tolliston, 2015). For campus ministries, helping fulfill the Great Commission is done specifically on a college or university campus through post-secondary students.

Church congregations may have certain ministries dedicated to the student demographic (i.e., a “young adult ministry”) but this is different than a campus ministry.

Campus ministries do not necessarily belong to a specific church congregation or denomination, and they tend to have their activities happen on-campus, adapted to the student life context. Often they are found on secular college and university campuses (rather than religiously affiliated educational institutions) to cater to the students who have religious beliefs. Campus ministries are best understood as parachurch organizations, which are faith-based organizations that operate alongside churches to provide supporting ministries that the church cannot do alone (Saunders, 2015). Campus ministries do not seek to replace church congregations, but assist the church in providing something unique and engaging for students (Saunders, 2015). Students may want to meet with other students of the same belief and be part of a religious community where they spend much of their time (on their campus). Often, campus ministries are registered student clubs with the specific college or university's students' union.

Canadian campus ministries are aware of some key contemporary issues relating to Christianity and young adults. Over half of North American young adults who grew up in the church later leave when they go through a transitional point in their lives, such as entering college or university (Penner et al., 2011). Only 63% of young adults whose religious affiliation was "evangelical" as a child maintain this affiliation as adults (Penner et al., 2011, p. 25). David Kinnaman from the Barna Group writes: "The problem is not that this generation has been less churched than the children and teens before them; the problem is that much spiritual energy fades away during a crucial decade of life – the twenties" (Kinnaman, 2011, p. 22). It is at this stage of life, from high school to late twenties, when the spiritual trajectory of a young person is decided (Kinnaman, 2011).

This is of concern to those working in youth groups, young adult ministries and

post-secondary student ministries. Campus ministries seek to connect with students from all levels of faith commitment, whether they are still exploring the Christian faith or are committed, mature Christians living out their faith. It is important for workers engaging with this generation of students to know these wide-scale trends of young adult behaviour seen in North America, so they can understand the spiritual needs of their ministry's demographic audience and respond in appropriate ways (Kinnaman, 2011). One observation made by the Barna Group is that the student generation struggles with "learning how to live faithfully in a new context, to be in the world but not of the world" (Kinnaman, 2011, p. 11), also known as the "Christ-and-culture paradox" (Schutlze & Woods, 2008, p. 22). Students want to be more engaged, to not just talk about faith but to put their faith into action (Kinnaman, 2011). These campus ministries offer just that.

Another issue that has been realized in recent years is that Christianity has an 'image problem', especially among young adults. In the book *unChristian*, six negative perceptions of Christians are presented based on U.S. research, stating that 'outsiders' (non-Christians) see Christians as: hypocritical, too focused on getting converts, anti-homosexual, sheltered, too political, and judgmental (Kinnaman & Lyons, 2007). To those who do not identify as Christian, the word "Christian" has more in common with a brand than a faith, and it is not viewed positively by millions of Americans (Kinnaman & Lyons, 2007). There are numerous complex background factors that influence these perceptions of Christianity, as people draw from first-hand experience, painful encounters with institutional churches, and secular media (Kinnaman & Lyons, 2007).

These negative perceptions typically form over time, and they may take even longer to renew into positive associations with Christians. Some evangelicals see a pre-

evangelism function in public relations to address negative claims and messages found in the mass media that declare Christianity is a stale and hypocritical religion in order to remove barriers for interpersonal conversations (Kerr, 2008). Kerr (2008) notes: “a growing number of ministries employ public relations to market stories and combat negative mainstream publicity about God and the faith” (p. 234).

However, this widespread issue of negative perceptions of Christianity is not solely counteracted and resolved through marketing tactics. Kinnaman and Lyons (2007) emphasize the solution is not to market the message of Jesus differently: “We do not “spin” the Christian message; we live it” (p. 207). Instead of changing Christianity’s reputation through branding, the solution is found in lived experiences through Christians becoming more Christlike: “*Christ followers must learn to respond to people in the way Jesus did*” through humility, grace and love in all situations and relationships (Kinnaman & Lyons, 2007, p. 204, emphasis in original). Christians who follow Jesus’ teachings will no longer fit the negative stereotypes of being hypocritical, anti-homosexual, and judgmental. These true Christ followers can represent Jesus to non-Christians, so “when outsiders begin to have fresh experiences and interaction with this new kind of Christian, perceptions will change, one person at a time” (Kinnaman & Lyons, 2007, p. 224).

In a way, campus ministries house the front-line workers of this inside-out reputation shift. Raising up more passionate, dedicated, Christ-like followers in young adulthood who will build relationships and share their faith with friends, roommates, classmates and teammates on their campus is one way that these negative perceptions of Christianity can be addressed and potentially changed. Focusing on evangelism, campus ministries seek to share the truth of the Gospel with non-believers both on campus and

around the world. As more Christians are established as confident, authentic Christ-followers, it is hoped that perceptions of Christianity will change through these personal, relational encounters.

2.2 History of P2C-S, IVCF, Navigators, and CCO

The four campus ministries (Power to Change – Students, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, The Navigators, and Catholic Christian Outreach) that are examined in this thesis were selected because of their similarities in size, mission and vision, and organizational structure. These parachurch organizations are non-denominational (i.e., do not adhere to a specific church denomination’s rules and leadership) and do not act as a church congregation through their regular activities. The exception to this is CCO, which works with a local priest and hosts mass throughout the week on campus. CCO also has additional activities beyond what the Catholic church provides, though. All four campus ministries would suit the “campus missionaries” model, as there are staff members whose full-time job is to support the ministry on a specific campus (or campuses), working on a non- or post-Christian campus with an evangelical orientation (Kidd, 2015).

These four groups are united in that they all focus on evangelism, discipleship, and mission mobilization in their ministry. Each organization seeks to help students become fully committed followers of Christ who are engaged with the Gospel, to find true meaning and purpose in life, to be trained for ministry, and to make a difference in this world (“About us,” P2C; “About,” IVCF; “About,” Navigators; “Who we are,” CCO). Some key goals for each ministry are to build relationships among students involved in the campus ministry, to equip them to share their faith with others, and to further the message of Jesus Christ (both on campus and around the world). Throughout

the year, these groups have small group meetings or Bible studies, large gatherings for worship or hearing a message, social events, conferences and retreats, and service or mission trip opportunities.

The concept of “spiritual multiplication” or “multiplying disciples” helps make the Great Commission possible and is used by these campus ministries. To reach the world, students who are disciples of Christ must help establish other disciples who can pass that on to others. Spiritual multiplication is:

building into others (discipling) to the point where they not only have a relationship with Jesus, but they are able to have the vision and skills to disciple others to the same point. Multiplying ourselves into others is what enables the message of the Gospel to be carried forth to the ends of the earth. (“Spiritual multiplication”, 2013)

This model is applied in campus ministries to further their goals of reaching the world with the Gospel, by dedicating time on a few people instead of concentrating on large numbers.

These campus ministries also focus on students for strategic reasons because they are future leaders, found in a range of professions and fields who can impact the world for good (“About us,” P2C; “Purpose,” IVCF; “Who we are,” Navigators; “Who we are,” CCO). Students on campus today will later become politicians, doctors, lawyers, engineers, educators, business-leaders, and other professions that put them in positions of influence. By reaching these people now when they are students, training them to be confident in their faith, how to live it out, and how to share it with others, will influence the world of tomorrow. Although each campus ministry has a unique mission and vision statement, elements like these are similar across the chosen organizations here.

There are some important differences in their focus and history, though. To start, Power to Change – Students has the mission to “change the world by helping students discover Jesus” with the purpose of their ministry to: 1) engage students with the Gospel, and 2) equip them for a lifetime of ministry (“About us”). The vision of this ministry is stated on its website: “We long for the day when no student graduates without engaging in the life-changing message of Jesus” (“What is our dream?”). It also focuses on sending “labourers into every segment of society and every nation” (“What is our dream?”). P2C-S was first established in Canada at UBC in 1967 by Josh McDowell with the name “Campus Crusade for Christ” (“Our global family”). Today, P2C-S is one of eleven ministries operated by Power to Change ministries in Canada, all of which seek to make Jesus known across Canada and the world (“Know our ministries”). There are more than 2,500 students actively involved with P2C-S in small groups that are growing in their faith and learning to share with others (“Who are our people?”). This takes place across 56 campuses in Canada with 200 staff supporting the work of this ministry (“Find my campus”; “Who are our people?”).

Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship’s mission is: “transforming youth, students and graduates, in all of their ethnic diversity, into fully committed followers of Jesus Christ” (“Home”). Some core values of IVCF that are manifest in their on-campus activities are: developing a faithful witness, cultivating spiritual growth, demonstrating Christian love, seeking all truth in Jesus Christ, shaping servant leaders, and growing a missional commitment (“Purpose”). This multi-ethnic campus ministry highlights their dedication to “intentionally reaching across boundaries that would otherwise separate people” in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, upbringing, economic or social status (“Multicultural/

Multi-ethnic ministry”). This ministry was established as a Canadian movement of students in the 1940s, modeled after those in the United Kingdom in 1929 (“History”). IVCF now exists on over 60 campuses across Canada with about 3,000 students involved on-campus (“Campus,” IVCF).

The Navigators help people ‘navigate the seas of life’: the organization began with a conversation between two sailors, Les Spencer and Dawson Trotter, in 1933 in which Les shared what he learned about faith and life with other sailors (“Our history”). Dawson founded The Navigators in 1935 around this model of one-on-one discipling and mentoring, and soon the ministry spread around the world, beginning in the early 1960s in Canada. The Navigators of Canada is a student movement, striving to follow Jesus’ example to love people in tangible ways (“Who we are,” Navigators). Their mission is to provide a safe community for students seeking their purpose in life, to love and guide them as they mature so they can pass on what they have learned and experienced to others (“Who we are,” Navigators). By engaging with the surrounding community, The Navigators have a vision to “see cities across the world transformed into places of peace, hope, and love” (“Who we are,” Navigators). In Canada, nearly 100 staff work with the 17 campus ministry locations across Canada (“Our history”). The precise number of students involved in the ministry is unclear, as students do not necessarily sign-up for the activities happening during a regular semester.

Catholic Christian Outreach is different from the other three campus ministries in terms of its doctrine and religious affiliation, as it is a Roman Catholic club for students, while the other three are Protestant evangelical Christian clubs. However, both denominations (Protestant and Catholic) are categorized as “Christian,” a term used to

describe “everyone who follows Jesus Christ” (Schultze & Woods, 2008, p. 20). Both could also be considered “evangelical” as they include people who “believe in Jesus Christ for personal salvation, view the Bible as the Word of God and seek to share their faith with others” (Schultze & Woods, 2008, p. 20). Evangelicals are a subgroup of Christians, which could involve different denominations – Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, or even entire denominations defined as evangelical (Schultze & Woods, 2008). According to Canada’s 2011 National Household Survey, Christians make up two thirds of Canada’s total population (22.8 million), and Catholics represent about half of all Christians (12.8 million) (Statistics Canada, 2013).

Therefore, Catholic Christian Outreach can be grouped together with these other Christian campus ministries.³ They focus on challenging students “to live in the fullness of the Catholic faith with a strong emphasis on becoming leaders in the renewal of the world” (“Who we are,” CCO). The three pillars of CCO are to proclaim, equip and commission (“Who we are,” CCO). CCO began in Canada by André and Angèle Regnier in response to Pope John Paul II calling Catholics to participate in New Evangelization (“Who we are,” CCO). The Regnier’s began CCO because they wanted to provide opportunities for growth to Catholic students, motivating them to deepen their relationship with Christ, develop leadership skills, and grow a heart to serve the Church (“FAQ”, 2012). CCO began at the University of Saskatchewan in 1988, and now the movement has spread to thirteen campuses by 2017 (“Who we are,” CCO). In 2015,

³ CCO was also included in the group of Canadian Christian ministry leaders who met together, described by P2C-S National Director Sean Cullen (2016a) in a blog post. Leaders from P2C-S, IVCF, Navigators, and CCO were present in this group of 10.

approximately 1,300 students were involved with CCO, supported by about 80 staff members (“Who we are,” CCO).

Another interesting similarity is that many of these Canadian organizations have roots in the United States, and the ministries exist alongside other national ministries around the world. Power to Change – Students was originally named “Campus Crusade for Christ”, established in 1951 at UCLA by Dr. Bill Bright, now operating as part of Campus Crusade for Christ International, or “Cru”, which has a presence in 190 countries (“Our global family”). Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship is part of the International Fellowship of Evangelical students that was founded in 1946, which now unites student ministries in more than 150 countries worldwide (“History”). The Navigators began in 1935 on a navy ship, and soon the ministry spread around the world, today having a ministry presence in over 100 countries (“Our history”). Although it may also be useful to consider the global online presence of each of these ministries, the sample chosen focuses only on the four Canadian campus ministries to limit the scope of the project.

2.3 Campus Ministries as Non-Profits

Campus ministries are non-profit organizations. They operate largely through donations, are run by teams of volunteers or staff, and they strive to create positive change in the world. The non-profits (campus ministries) considered in this project seek donations for their operations and staff (who are considered missionaries), recruit volunteers for events and regular activities (who may be students or alumni), and seek to change the world through sharing the message of Jesus Christ.

As non-profit organizations, these campus ministries have unique qualities that make them different from for-profit organizations. Non-profit communications efforts

have different goals, including fundraising, public education or outreach, and advocacy (Durham, 2010). In the corporate world, returns on investment (ROI) is commonly measured by profit and earnings, but with non-profits the impact of communications is measured in other ways, specifically by its ability to support and advance a mission or set of non-monetary principles (Durham, 2010). This communications work relates back to the organization's objectives (based on its mission and vision) to determine how resources should be allocated (Durham, 2010). In some cases, non-profit organizations have limited resources in staff and finances for operations that for-profits may prioritize highly, such as marketing, while others may put significant funds towards their communications and branding efforts.

Nearly every organization (whether for-profit or non-profit) has a public image and reputation. They want to affect what people think about when they hear the organization's name or see its logo, so there is significant thought that goes into these decisions. With non-profits, what is "sold" is different than with for-profits, but they still want to appeal to specific groups of people to gain more support and members. This study does not explore, analyze, and critique the image, public reputation or brand differentiation of each campus ministry, but is instead interested in the broader strategies these organizations use to communicate with supporters, adherents and followers online.

This chapter provided an overview of the goals and work of Christian campus ministries, and specific histories of the four campus ministries explored in this project. It highlighted some key contemporary issues facing Christianity today and how these campus ministries can respond well to them. As faith-based non-profit organizations, these groups seek to change the world through their religious values: by sharing the

Gospel with others, both on campus and around the world. In order to further explore the complexities of the context that these campus ministries operate in, a review of relevant literature follows.

3 Chapter: Literature Review: Non-Profits, Promotional Culture, (Digital) Media, Religion, and Dialogic Communication

3.1 Marketing Better: For-Profit and Non-Profit Alike

3.1.1 Defining Marketing

Marketing can be defined as “the activity, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large” (American Marketing Association). It moves a consumer through the purchasing process – increase awareness, influence desire, encourage trial, facilitate purchase, and cement brand loyalty – and marketers target various stages of this cycle (Tuten & Solomon, 2013). Advertising similarly moves audiences to do something, but is more interested in the means by which this takes place. Advertisements can be seen as: “(1) enticements to buy, use or believe something; (2) identifiers of the advertiser; and (3) presentations in a particular, paid medium (e.g., buying space in a paper or time on TV)” (Cornwell, 2008, p. 211).

A related practice involved in this mix is branding, which involves the “collection of perceptions about an organization, formed by its every communication, action, and interaction. It is what people collectively say, feel, and think about your organization” (Daw & Cone, 2010, p. 20). Branding marks difference or distinction between products that are functionally the same in terms of use and quality (Knight, 2010). Good branding is of critical importance for commercial brands as this helps sell their product, but non-profits are increasingly using branding strategies to position themselves as distinctly different from other similar non-profit organizations.

3.1.2 For-Profit and Non-Profit Marketing Literature

In many marketing and public relations journals and publications, the goal of the research centers around one thought: how to do it better. Marketing and advertising are typically viewed and understood from a business perspective, presenting specific practices and approaches commonly used by marketers to make a sale. Marketing and advertising (as well as branding) are categorized as sales practices, but have a few differences in focus.

These marketing practices are often presented in a profit-driven context according to commercial applications and market exchanges. Non-profits follow suit, even though their organization and activities are arguably more complex than selling products to consumers. From its inception, the term “marketing” was understood as applicable for helping a business improve its competitiveness and profitability, to increase sales, and stand out from competition (Wymer, 2013). Andreason (2012) notes that both for-profit and non-profit sectors have behavioral goals but they seek different things: “Commercial marketers seek sales. Nonprofit and social marketers sometimes seek sales (though not always) and have myriad other audience behaviors they must optimize” (p. 38). Communication with non-profit audiences is more complex and challenging than with for-profit organizations, since “in for-profits most activities are focused on reaching just one audience – the customer” (Durham, 2010, p. 56) while non-profits also consider supporters, volunteers, and members. Conceptually, for-profit models do not accurately fit with non-profit activities and organizational structure. The field of marketing (and accompanying definitions) appears to be too narrow to encompass non-profit and social marketing, as views of marketing continue to have a “business bias” (Andreason, 2012).

This begins to demonstrate how there are tensions between for-profit marketing and non-profit marketing as the goals and activities behind these sectors and the types of organizations within them vary significantly. There may be issue with non-profits adapting marketing strategies from the for-profit sector because of this, as they may view donors and members as customers whose primary value rests in their purchasing power. Wymer, Boenigk & Möhlmann (2015) suggest non-profit marketing should be understood from a distinct orientation, as “an organized, planned set of activities carried out in order to attract support for the brand object (e.g., nonprofit organization or charity)” and include more than a market exchange relationship (p. 126).

Recently, as for-profit organizations have already done, non-profits have incorporated digital media into their traditional communication strategies as well. The potential of the Internet to serve non-profit organizations and reach their goals is repeatedly highlighted in research on website and social media use. Waters & Lo (2012) explain, “The Internet has given nonprofits an unprecedented arsenal of resources to disseminate their messages and communicate directly with stakeholders” (p. 299). The typical approach regarding the Internet’s affordances is optimistic with regard to its capacity to create participation and open dialogue with publics, and often researchers discover that non-profit organizations do not take full advantage of Web 2.0 as a tool to build relationships and dialogue with members and stakeholders (Kent & Taylor, 1998; Taylor, Kent & White, 2001; Kent, Taylor & White, 2003; Smith, 2007). The focus is often on the benefits of using the Web to engage with interested publics, the effectiveness of social media marketing, and recommendations for helping these organizations reach

their audience better. There is less research in this area from a critical media studies perspective that questions the deeper effects of these practices.

In fact, there are entire books dedicated to the argument that non-profits should be more promotionally oriented. Some common ones include: *Five Good Ideas: Practical Strategies for Non-Profit Success* (Broadbent & Omidvar, 2011), *Breakthrough Non-profit Branding: Seven Principles to Power Extraordinary Results* (Daw & Cone, 2010), *The Networked Non-Profit: Connecting with Social Media to Drive Change* (Kanter & Fine, 2010) and *Social Marketing: Changing Behaviours for Good* (Lee & Kotler, 2016). My approach in this thesis is different. Rather than adding to the literature on *how to do* social media marketing, I occupy a more critical position by asking, ‘what happens when non-profits become more promotionally oriented?’

3.2 Promotional Culture and Advertising in Critical Communication Studies

3.2.1 Advertising and Branding

Critical perspectives and theoretical approaches from the field of Communications or Media Studies focus on different areas within advertising, marketing and branding. Advertising combines elements of information and art, but it can be understood as belonging more closely to rhetoric (Wernick, 1991). Communication scholars view advertising as a semiotic process of meaning-making operating in consumer culture (Berger, 2010). Jhally (1987) explains how advertisers create an image to be fixed to the product: “once the real meaning has been systematically *emptied* out of commodities...advertising then *refills* this void with its own symbols” – symbols which promise an added value (p. 51, emphasis in original). Dyer (1998) also notes that in ads

“the meaning of one *thing* is transferred to or made interchangeable with another *quality*, whose value attaches itself to the *product*” (p. 117, emphasis in original).

Branding is also seen a highly symbolic process, as it operates through “surrounding a product with layers of symbolism in an attempt to give it a meaning” (Gray, 2010, p. 311). In this way, “the brand name has become the principal signifier of difference, rather than the products themselves. The brand name, logo, and slogan have become a shorthand” (Knight, 2010, p. 174). These understandings of advertising and branding from a Communication Studies perspective inform the following discussion of promotional culture.

3.2.2 Promotional Culture

Considering these understandings of marketing, advertising, and branding, Wernick explores how “the promotional mode has extended to all facets of social communication” (Wernick, 1991, p. 195). Writing in 1991, Wernick describes the developments in commercial advertising of consumer goods beginning in the 1960s and how the promotion of goods in the market is considered throughout the design process. Although the media landscape looks different today (digital, networked, mobile, more ad-saturated), his foundational theories on promotional culture are still relevant. In the foundational text *Promotional Culture*, Wernick (1991) presents the effects of promotional culture in spheres that were not initially commodified but now operate according to a market logic – politics and the university – a list which has expanded to further sectors or spheres in the 21st century.

Promotional culture goes beyond advertisements and their instrumental process of the sales pitch, as promotion “crosses the line between advertising, packaging, and

design” (Wernick, 1991, p. 181). A promotional message is “a complex of significations which at once represents (moves in place of), advocates (moves on behalf of), and anticipates (moves ahead of) the circulating entity or entities to which it refers” (Wernick, 1991, p. 182). Promotional culture is thus a system of these circulating promotional messages. This system came about because of the “environment in which capitalist forms of exchange came to dominate all other forms of exchange” (Aronczyk & Powers, 2010, p. 4). This occurs on both a symbolic and material level, as Wernick claims “promotionalism” is the dominant symbolic language, the “communicative substance” of contemporary capitalism (Aronczyk & Powers, 2010, p. 4). Market values and commodity relations have been extended into all areas of life (Hearn, 2010).

In these ways, promotionalism is an entire self-confirming, integrated system of production and promotion, where “the commodity and its double – the commodity-sign and the promotional sign – are deployed together in a mutually referring and self-confirming way” (Wernick, 1991, p. 16). He calls this the “vortex of publicity” where the meanings of ads are interdependent among themselves in a discourse of promotion, and non-advertising publicity also serves promotional ends (Wernick, 1991). This is a constant cycle of promotions referring to other promotions. Promotional culture is a powerful force that has come to define how we understand our social world, as even consumers can get caught up in the vortex of promotional signs.

3.2.3 Promotional Culture in the Digital Era

Contemporary scholars have expanded Wernick’s concept of promotional culture to new examples and contexts over the past 25 years. In *Blowing Up the Brand: Critical Perspectives on Promotional Culture*, Aronczyk & Powers (2010) draw on Wernick and

emphasize how “brands have become structuring elements of our everyday lives” and branding models have even extended to a wide range of previously non-corporatized institutional forms (e.g., public institutions) (p. 3). Powell (2013), in *Promotional Culture and Convergence: Markets, Methods, Media*, explores the changing relationship between the media and promotional industries in a culture of convergence. Davis (2013) investigates in *Promotional Cultures: The Rise and Spread of Advertising, Public Relations, Marketing and Branding* how the professions and practices of promotion have spread and influenced society generally, and how both individuals and organizations have become more promotionally oriented.

Bringing the conversation into the current decade requires examining shifts in media use and the characteristics of dominant media forms. Arguably, today there are more opportunities for a consumer to engage with an organization or corporation in novel ways. Sharing about certain brands online (i.e., “liking” a brand’s Page on Facebook) actually works in the service of the brand: online users have become “promotional intermediaries” without gaining financially (Aronczyk & Powers, 2010, p. 11). When doing so, users are distracted by the positive qualities of the Internet associated with interactivity: as collaborative, participatory, and democratic (Aronczyk & Powers, 2010). They click, like, and share on social media without considering the power relations underneath (Aronczyk & Powers, 2010) or how the organization may be further promoting itself. The consumer acts as the marketer, which is seen even from a young age: teens do this to win contests or in hopes of gaining recognition and receiving a response from the brand (Koughan & Rushkoff, 2014).

This free, digital labour is done by users as active participants, with little consideration for how they are contributing to the site's operations and the brand's marketing campaigns, all without compensation (Brown & Quan-Haase, 2012). Web 2.0 sites (including social media) can be considered "highly exploitative in that they profit from the work of 'users' and do not offer a wage in return for this labour" (Brown & Quan-Haase, 2012, p. 488). Actions like these (working for a company without being paid) have helped normalize unpaid labour in the wider economy, making work through unpaid internships accepted in our society. These contemporary critical perspectives which examine promotional culture in the current media environment challenge these practices made available through new technological forms, which are in fact further contributing to the wider system of promotional culture.

There are also overlaps between promotional culture and religion. Research conducted by the Barna Group (2015) on Millennials and church attendance explains: "consumer culture shapes what people expect of church and how some churches approach ministry". The church can be thought of as the "religious services industry", the sector of the economy that provides consumers with spiritual goods and experiences (Barna Group, 2015). Even churches and religious organizations are impacted by the wider promotional and consumer culture, which has instilled values, beliefs and expectations from culture into other areas of life (the spiritual). Leaders may see their faith communities in this way and seek to solve a problem (like declining numbers of Millennials in their community) by creating brand loyalty or providing a better product (Barna Group, 2015). This mindset can be damaging, and it impacts what attendees (and potential attendees) think of the church or religious organization. A church should be

different from other options in the marketplace, “above or beyond the dirty business of *sell, sell, sell*” (Barna Group, 2015, emphasis in original). What is unfortunate is that churches do not always appear so different.

Aronczyk & Powers (2010) state: “Our goal is neither to lament this new branded world nor cheer it...That promotional culture creates some opportunities for engagement as well as forecloses upon others is certain” (p. 21). In this project, I take a similar approach in identifying both opportunities and risks of promotional culture applied to the non-profit. Knight (2010) recognizes how branding and promotional culture similarly work for civil society organizations, particularly in public spaces. This promotional system is so powerful that the logic of capitalism and perpetual promotion has expanded beyond the for-profit world and infiltrated the space occupied by non-profit organizations. These are some of the conditions in which non-profit organizations now exist and must operate.

3.3 Digital Technologies and Social Media

3.3.1 Defining and Understanding Media and Technology

The word “technology” can be defined in broad terms to include all “humanly fabricated material artifacts whose function depends on a specific materiality as such” (Mitcham, 1994, p. 161). Often we view technology as the physical devices and tools that we use, but technology can include a whole range of human activities and objects (Schuurman, 2013). In a similar vein, “media” can be defined broadly to be something that stands in between, or a vehicle that carries meaning (McLuhan, 1964; Peters, 2015). Looking to the contemporary media environment, a digital medium can be seen as a

device, tool or technology that delivers some kind of data or information that stands between the one creating and the one receiving (Challies, 2015).

A number of communication and media theorists reveal that technology is not neutral, and how technologies, on their own, are embedded with certain values that have effects simply because of their characteristics and design. Ellul (1964) argues technology is laden with values that shape social and cultural practices. Winner (1980) asks “do artefacts have politics?”, exploring the characteristics of technical objects and their meaning: how they can be designed to produce a set of consequences, or be compatible with certain relationships of power and authority. Similarly, Postman (1992) states, “embedded in every tool is an ideological bias, a predisposition to construct the world as one thing rather than another, to value one thing over another” (p. 1). Carey’s (1983) work on the telegraph highlights the technology’s impact on how communication was thought about (through the separation of communication and transportation). Lastly, Innis (1950, 1951), attends to characteristics of media to examine their social significance, speaking of the ‘bias of communication’ and how certain technologies are more suitable to communicate or deliver knowledge across time or across space, which impacts the cultures in which they are used.

Technologies are biased towards certain uses and can have a real effect on our world. This impacts the way we interact with them and view them as a part of our lives. In light of this, we should respond by carefully evaluating our technology use. As well as considering what a new technology makes possible, we should also ask what is made more difficult or impossible (Crouch, 2008), an evaluation takes effortful critical thought.

This research does just this, by carefully tracing the material characteristics of social media technologies and how they intersect with promotional culture and religious groups.

3.3.2 Development and Characteristics of Web 2.0

The rise of the Internet and networked society has radically shifted the way we connect with one another, regard information, and do business. Like other new technologies, we should pause to reflect on the effects of these changes. Common understandings of the current era posit that we are in the Information Age, a time of information abundance or “glut” with unprecedented access to information and data online through our new digital technologies. Detweiler (2013) notes: “Never have so many people been able to create and distribute so many words and images. We are uploading our videos and updating our statuses in dizzying ways. We are inundated by too much information (of our own making)” (p. 15). We do not know how to effectively deal with all this information, despite the algorithms and search engines that help us filter and make sense of it all. The Information Age we know today seems entirely overwhelming, but earlier writers commented on the information abundance witnessed from other technological developments: for example, the printing press enabling the reproduction of texts, the spread of knowledge, and increases in literacy (Eisenstein, 1979). People have experienced information overload before, largely due to the media that enabled the information to be produced, reproduced, and disseminated. The difference today, though, is in the unprecedented scale and speed of data production and the subsequent use of computing technologies for data processing.

The Internet has developed from its first design in terms of capabilities for its users. Tim Berners-Lee built the first web browser and web pages in his 1990 project, the

World Wide Web (Detweiler, 2013). He connected hypertext technology to the Internet, forming a new type of networked communication of weblogs, list-serves and email services (van Dijck, 2013). The initial capabilities of the Internet were quite limited: Web 1.0 was heavily text-based, at times it required users be competent in HTML language, and it essentially just created links for networked communication (van Dijck, 2013). Engagement online was more one-dimensional, with limited capacity for people to produce their own content. Also in the early design of the Web, much attention was focused on e-commerce so users were seen as potential customers who needed to be convinced to buy online goods and services (Lovink, 2011).

“Web 2.0” is the next generation of the Internet, defined by Musser & O’Reilly (2007) as “a more mature, distinctive medium characterized by user participation, openness, and network effects” (p. 5). The focus shifted from e-commerce to a more participatory culture, giving users more of a voice (Lovink, 2011). This version of the Web enhanced the capabilities of online technology, enabling more interactivity characterized by user control, freedom and dialogue (Musser & O’Reilly, 2007). User interfaces in Web 2.0 are accessible and interactive, which levels the playing field between producers and consumers, contributing to a decentralization of authority (Tuten & Solomon, 2013). These effects are pushed further when noting how the Internet works alongside other new media technologies (e.g., computers, mobile phones, and social networks). There are three distinguishing features of Web 2.0, which remain the generally accepted and commonly understood characteristics of the Internet’s current iteration: that it is easy to use, facilitates sociality, and provides users with free publishing platforms that allow content to be uploaded in any form (Lovink, 2011).

3.3.3 Social Media

Social media networking developed by building off of the capabilities of Web 2.0. Social media are often defined in relation to the Web applications that exemplify it (social networking sites like Facebook, media hosting sites like YouTube, or micro-blogging platforms like Twitter) (Halavais, 2014). One definition that encompasses social media's broad use is: "networked information services designed to support in-depth social interaction, community formation, collaborative opportunities, and collaborative work" (Hunsinger & Senft, 2014, p. 1). Social media refers to technology platforms where people gather online to share information, and can create or share content in words, pictures, videos, and audios (Neiger et al., 2012).

In literature that highlights the benefits of social media, the following elements are presented. Social networking created new ways for people to connect, share information, learn, interact, and express themselves. Consumers were now able to not only find information online, but also share it with other people in their networks. These sites transformed users who were passive observers into active participants, turning traditional models of mass communication into a democratized, many-to-many model (Detweiler, 2013). These sites have been celebrated as liberating, democratizing forces, used by activist groups to disseminate their messages and organize protests (Detweiler, 2013). People are moving online to do a range of activities through social networking, whether it is to gather information, share their stories, or create social change.

Facebook is one of the most dominant, frequently visited social networking sites in the world. Founded in 2004, its reported mission is to "give people the power to share and make the world more open and connected", as "people use Facebook to stay

connected with friends and family, to discover what's going on in the world, and to share and express what matters to them" ("About," Facebook). Facebook's promotional slogan is "Making the Web more social" and its tagline on the sign-in page is "Connect with friends and the world around you on Facebook"⁴; both of these phrases highlight how this service can benefit the common good and everyday user who values social connectedness (van Dijck, 2013, p. 11). By September 2016, there were 1.79 billion monthly active Facebook users, which is double the 500 million active users in the year 2012 ("Company info," Webb et al., 2012). Facebook is the most popular social media platform: the Pew Research Center's "Social Media Update" in 2016 found 79% of Internet users use Facebook, and 76% of Facebook users use the site on a daily basis (Greenwood, Perrin, & Duggan, 2016). Initially, only college students were allowed to become members (in founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg's original conception of "The Facebook" for Harvard University in 2004), and the site still remains most popular among college aged students who can interact and share information and news with their "friends" in this network (Webb et al., 2012; Yaros, 2012).

Research has found social networks are not primarily used to make new friends, but more often to augment, maintain, solidify, or supplement already existing offline relationships (Pempek, Yermolayeva, & Calvert, 2009; Webb et al., 2012; Paulin et al., 2014). The main purpose of these online connections is interpersonal, but interactions between users and corporations or organizations can be included in these connections.

⁴ This tagline has evolved over the years. In 2006 it was "Facebook is a social utility that connects with the people around you", in 2008 it was altered to "Facebook helps you connect and share with the people in your life", and in 2009 it became "Facebook gives people the power to share and make the world more open and connected" (O'Neill, 2008; Reagan, 2009; Arrington, 2008).

3.3.4 Advertising Online

Social networking platforms, especially Facebook, are appealing for organizations who wish to reach online audiences because of the site's huge user base, the ability to create a Page on Facebook for free, and the nature of the network being used for inter-personal connections. More generally, companies and organizations have incorporated digital marketing into their communications mix, interacting with users and delivering information through various channels online. Some channels are static and more one-way (email, newsletters, websites) but social media allows organizations to do more than deliver information, holding potential for back-and-forth dialogue to take place (Keller, 2013). On social networking sites it is not only users who interact and engage in conversation with each other, but also users interacting with organizations. It is important for organizations to have up-to-date information on their pages and to respond to users who give feedback, ask questions, or state their allegiance ("liking" their Page or posts). Since one strength of social media is the word-of-mouth approach to disseminating information, it can be seen as a remarkable tool for online marketing (Bradley, 2011).

Social media marketing involves "using social media technologies, channels, and software to create, communicate, deliver, and exchange offerings that have value for an organization's stakeholders" (Tuten & Solomon, 2013, p. 14). These practices have expanded rapidly since the early-2000s, often complementing traditional marketing rather than substituting it (Tuten & Solomon, 2013). Social media marketing has been so easily incorporated because of its low absolute costs and seemingly limitless organic (unpaid) posts to reach followers and manage customer relationships with the company (Tuten & Solomon, 2013; Agozinno, 2012). As Web 2.0 allows for networking and interacting with

each other, social media marketing enables more personalized, horizontally aligned relationships between brands and users. Communication on social media feels more personal and conversational compared to traditional electronic and print media, and this also applies to consumer interactions with organizations (Guo, 2012).

It is important to note that social media marketing operates differently than the previous traditional one-way marketing strategies, especially when it comes to organization-public relationships. Because of this, new techniques need to be used for organizations to have an effective online presence (Fish, 2009). Traditional media marketing strategies are designed to reach the masses rather than individuals, so if companies want to create and maintain meaningful relationships with their audiences through social media, then a different mindset must be taken (Luca, 2011). On social media, the company's image must still be controlled and maintained, as it is a formal communication channel, but the company should feel free to personally respond to users as they seek to create relationships with them. Using Facebook for marketing implies a form of relationship between organization and user, even if it is minimal (i.e., if a user "likes" the Page, this demonstrates their interest in the organization) which suggests mutual interaction (Fish, 2009).

In general, marketers will adapt to trends in media and technology use in order to further the objectives of their company and reach their audiences where they are, taking advantage of whatever benefit they can find in the channel they use. Some companies have found that they get more traffic on their Facebook Page rather than their website, so they have shifted their efforts to Facebook advertising campaigns (Neff, 2010).

3.3.5 Critical Perspectives of the Internet and Social Media

Along with these perspectives on the development of Web 2.0 and social media marketing there are also some counter-dialogues taking place that challenge such positive approaches and claims. How much freedom and control do users have on the Internet? Is the participation, openness, accessibility and interactivity actually creating meaningful dialogue between users? Although social media *feels* more personal and conversational (how users can interact with brands), this horizontal alignment may only be an appearance. There is still a hierarchical power relationship in play here between the organization and the user, arguably the same relationship that has existed for decades.

At first the Internet was heralded for its democratic potential, but some critics argue that the Internet has done the opposite, whether considering its material properties and technical infrastructure, or from a political economic perspective. Van Dijck (2012) notes “social media sites do not automatically turn all users into active participants” (p. 147). Public discourse and participation in online discussion tends to take place within “echo chambers” where “groups of like-minded individuals, consciously or not, avoid debate with their cultural or political adversaries” (Lovink, 2011, p. 2). The filter bubbles and algorithms used on search engines and social networking sites are producing posts for users to see that do not encourage democratic discussion.

A platform’s architecture – its interface, design, code, and algorithms – can have a significant impact on how individuals use the site and what information is presented to them. An algorithm is “a finite list of well-defined instructions for calculating a function, a step-by-step directive for processing or automatic reasoning that orders the machine to produce a certain output from given input” (van Dijck, 2011 p. 30). A user’s experience

on a site is not entirely up to them, as “users are *directed to* content by the algorithms and protocols hiding behind the site’s visible interface features: buttons to view ‘most popular’ videos, buttons to choose content categories and ‘like’ buttons to express one’s fondness” (van Dijck, 2012, p. 149, emphasis in original). Algorithms pre-select what information is represented, as it is “shaped and conditioned by the technological structure of the platform” (Schou & Farkas, 2016, p. 36). Specific content can be favoured by the site as certain posts are made more visible at the expense of others, with the Facebook algorithm rewarding the ‘right’ kind of sharing that will increase ‘likes’ and ‘shares’ (Bucher, 2012; Bucher, 2017).

Various communication scholars have written on algorithms in recent years, exploring their power, relevance, accountability, and how they are experienced in everyday life (Bucher, 2017). Materialist perspectives here are not naïvely technologically deterministic, seeing new media as merely neutral tools, but look at complex insights surrounding these technologies (Schou & Farkas, 2016). They also consider the ways humans can have agency, informed by Latour’s (2005) actor-network theory that “aims to map relations between technologies and people, and tries to explain how these relations are both material and semiotic” (van Dijck, 2013, p. 26). In this perspective, both people and objects have agency, so “non-human elements, like algorithms, affect how people act and how they are controlled” (van Dijck, 2012, p. 151). Platforms like Facebook are also active agents “in the co-creation and shaping of how information can and is presented, distributed, and made available” (Schou & Farkas, 2016, p. 38). A multi-layered approach such as van Dijck’s (2012) or a materialist

approach like Schou & Farkas' (2016) are useful to better comprehend the complexities of our networked culture and the various actors at play shaping our experiences online.

Considering the political economy of the Internet and social media, thinkers like Robert McChesney (2014) explore how the political and economic arrangement of the Internet and corporate powers damage democracy, as the users are not the ones in control but a handful of players such as Google and Facebook. Tufekci similarly (2016) notes: "As the Internet matures, its initial decentralized form has been increasingly replaced by a small number of ad-financed platforms...which structure the online experience of billions of people" (p. 65). Van Dijck (2012) highlights "it is impossible to disregard existing power relations through which new platforms emerge" (p. 51). Castells (2009) also explores the political and economic implications of evolving social media platforms, which operate in the same space as mass media that is dominated by powerful telecom and media industries. New commercial enterprises like Facebook are then competing with these media conglomerates for a share of the domain and audiences (Castells, 2009).

Those running the Internet empires are the ones who benefit, in large part through providing information on users to advertisers. The default business model on the Web is advertising: "Internet platforms are financed by ads that demand a great scale, and they are fueled by network effects" (Tufekci, 2016, p. 74). Website owners are not interested in the created content itself, but the "(meta-) data revealing patterns of user's interests and behavior" so giants like Google can "sell relevant information and space to advertisers" (van Dijck, 2012, p. 149). Direct marketing data are provided to marketers from mining data on user profiles and collecting demographic details (Lovink, 2011). This big data is collected from the digital paths that users take, used to create personally

targeted ads that appear in an optimal time and location based on their previous actions online (Couldry & Turow, 2014). Marketers have an unprecedented amount of knowledge about potential consumers at an individual level.

Methods for acquiring such data on users has evolved from the broadcast era, which traditionally involved directly asking questions to individuals and grouping the public into demographic categories (Tufekci, 2016; Kosinski, Stillwell & Graepel, 2013). Today, data gathered from a user's digital records, information that has never been explicitly disclosed by those individuals, is used to infer characteristics of the user (Tufekci, 2016). Kosinski, Stillwell & Graepel (2013) found that a collection of a user's Facebook likes could model a range of outcomes, including "sexual orientation, ethnicity, religious and political views, personality traits, intelligence, happiness, use of addictive substances, parental separation, age, and gender" (p. 5802). Facebook holds data that can be used to identify individuals in these ways. The interface and algorithms are designed to make the site advertiser-friendly and keep users on the site, feeding off of content that is positive which users will "like" (Freakonomics Radio, 2016; Tufekci, 2016).

Connectivity online has become a form of social capital, a resource to be capitalized and managed by organizations (van Dijck, 2012). Users are considered online 'participants' (not 'viewers', 'customers' or 'audiences') and their activity contributes to the site's worth, whether they are actively posting or passively viewing content (van Dijck, 2012, p. 147). In the documentary *Generation Like*, Douglas Rushkoff speaks to teens on how they use social media, questioning if these young consumers are really empowered or if marketers are the ones in control. Kids say they feel empowered: that the Internet is a place for them to have a voice, show their talent, and broaden who they

talk to (Koughan & Rushkoff, 2014). But the content they provide and the connections they have are worth much more to companies that know how to turn “likes” into money; the currency in the social media world are likes, follows, friends, and retweets (Koughan & Rushkoff, 2014; Tufekci, 2016). The value of Twitter, Facebook and Instagram is raised, not based on profits, but from the amount of likes these sites generate (Koughan & Rushkoff, 2014). Since “the number of connections users make through a platform raises its monetary value” the architecture of social media sites will push users to constantly connect with others (van Dijck, 2012, p. 147).

A different critical perspective on the Internet is Nicholas Carr’s examination of the Internet’s effect on our biology from a neurological view. In his article *Is Google Making Us Stupid?* he argues that constantly switching between windows and sites and frantically using search engines will ultimately dumb us down, making us skimmers instead of deep readers (Carr, 2008). He also writes “when we go online, we enter an environment that promotes cursory reading, hurried and distracted thinking, and superficial learning” (Carr, 2010, p. 115-116).

These are some of the concerns raised by critical thinkers about the Internet and social media and its impact on democracy and participation. They seek to reveal the power relations that exist underneath, and the technical infrastructure (interface, design, code, algorithms, etc.) that remain hidden from the average user. In this way, the architecture and technical processes of the Internet and social media are black-boxed, opaque, and secretive (van Dijck, 2012). Only the owners of the platform understand and have access to the codes and designs of the site’s interface, algorithms, and methods of collecting and selling user data. They control how much users can see, and Facebook

keeps its algorithm hidden as “business secrets” (Schou & Farkas, 2016, p. 41). Similarly, the huge datasets of information found from a user’s online footprints are collected in an unnoticed, latent manner (Tufekci, 2014). The challenge of the technological structure of sites like Facebook is that these dimensions of the platform are invisible (or become invisible), so users may forget their presence altogether (Schou & Farkas, 2016). Algorithms are largely inaccessible and difficult to comprehend without the technical know-how, as they are “*invisible by design*, and not just due to inattentiveness on the user’s part” (Schou & Farkas, 2016, p. 43, emphasis in original).

As social networking sites have proven influential on various aspects of life (including social relations and marketing), social media has gained more attention and research. Scholars such as Yochai Benkler suggest that a big challenge for everyday Internet users is they do not know how it all works: who owns the major web browsers, the surveillance of our online actions, and the degree of privacy we truly have (Freakonomics Radio, 2016). To educate people on this, the critical first step is to get people to care about their online environment and have a decent representation of the problems behind the technologies that people have come to love (Freakonomics Radio, 2016). Some research has been conducted on how people understand algorithms in their everyday lives, and although users do not necessarily have an inside knowledge of the coding of algorithms, they do have a basic acknowledgement that Facebook tracks their data and that algorithms impact what appears on their News Feed (Bucher, 2017). Users may even behave intentionally online to anticipate and potentially steer the algorithm to produce something more desirable (van Dijck, 2012). They cannot directly change the algorithms underlying Facebook, but individuals can engage in “careful appropriations

and purposeful misuses” to confuse, trick and take advantage of the algorithm (Schou & Farkas, 2016). As well, Internet users can do a “digital detox” by educating themselves on how their personal data is collected and monetized, and take practical steps to detox their online lives to be more in control of their digital selves (Me and My Shadow, 2016).

Keeping in mind these practices hiding behind the Internet and social media, as well as the countless ways these technologies have impacted our lives, is important to remember when making claims about the potential of the Internet and social media for organizations. A number of approaches have been taken to analyze the Internet, social media, the material properties of these technologies, and the social, political, and economic conditions in which they currently exist. These perspectives provide valuable insight into contemporary culture and everyday user’s experiences, by deconstructing the various elements of social media platforms and how they operate.

3.4 Religion Plus Media: Ethical Questions of Use from Print to the Internet

3.4.1 Religion and Media

Studying religion and media involves multiple disciplines and approaches. For the purposes of this study, the following questions were considered in structuring a review of relevant literature: Can religion and media co-exist, or are they mutually exclusive categories? Can religious experience take place only in mind and spirit, or also in physical media forms? Is it morally right to use new media technology (i.e., a website) for religious purposes? Are there distinct Christian perspectives of media and technology use? These questions have been explored by academics and pastors alike, and there are a range of responses: media and technology can be seen as both an opportunity and a threat for religious purposes, as something containing great potential or something to be feared.

There is a growing body of literature exploring the relationship between religion and media that examine various religious practices and a range of media forms. Stolow (2013) researches instances of media impacting religion, and he challenges typical understandings of religion and technology as mutually exclusive categories (with the authentic spiritual experience on one hand, and manmade technology on the other). He instead explores how to locate “god *in* the machine” (Stolow, 2013, p. 3 emphasis in original). Religious practices “can only be manifested through some process of mediation” or putting in material terms, which is seen in the written texts, ritual gestures, images and icons, architecture, music, special garments, and markings on the flesh used for religious purposes (Stolow, 2005, p.125). As well, certain media have had significant impacts on religion. Lundby (2013) notes, “Religions are to a large extent shaped by their dominant means of communication. Whether they are mainly oral, codified in writing, or further distributed in print has significance” (p. 226). One key example of this is the printing press, which was an “agent of change” in the Protestant Reformation in Europe (Eisenstein, 1979). Similarly, Innis (1951) reveals how the dominant means of communication used by a culture impacts how religion could be preserved throughout time or expand across space. For example, religions of the book are shaped by the book’s portability and durability: texts could be easily distributed and shared across space, and the written word was better preserved on parchment than papyrus (which builds the body of religious writings) (Innis, 1951). In these ways, media use is integral to religion.

3.4.2 Religion and the Internet

In more contemporary thought, scholars such as Heidi Campbell look at the intersection of religion and digital media. In this sub-field, research explores how

individuals perform their religious identity online, how online and offline religious spheres blend together, and how digital media and religious practice shape each other. Questions surrounding authority, authenticity, community, identity, and ritual appear in these studies (Campbell, 2013).

One distinction that is made in this research is the difference between religion online and online religion. Hadden & Cowan (2000) describe “religion online” as information provided to the Web visitor about religion or religious tradition (doctrine, service opportunities, books and articles, etc.) and “online religion” as sites that invite the visitor to “*participate in the religious dimension of life via the Web*” such as prayer, ritual, or meditation with the online space acting as a church, temple, synagogue or mosque (p. 9, emphasis in original). In recent years there has been rising concern with online religion and that as “technology might become a substitute for God, the Internet could draw people away from organized religion” (Campbell & Calderon, 2007, p. 262).

This concern has been explored and addressed. For many believers, Christian community is made up of offline friendships and affiliations, as well as online ones (Campbell & Calderon, 2007). An interesting finding in this research is that people tend to participate in online religion as a supplement to their in-person, offline religious attendance (Campbell & Calderon, 2007; Katz & Rice, 2002). This observation is similar to how users interact with friends on social media generally: not to create new relationships, but to supplement existing ones (Webb et al., 2012). Another study found that one website for Chabad Jews was not used to create a community online, but to disseminate information and encourage visitors to have in-person encounters with a Rabbi (Pearl, 2014). Thus, not all websites that are religiously oriented are seeking to

create entirely new virtual communities for their believers. In fact, online communities may be limited in providing a religious encounter that is beneficial to the specific religious belief. This also can be applied not just to community-building, but evangelism, as “cyberspace can be used for evangelization, but it might never be as effective as in-person relationship building” (Schutlze & Woods, 2008, p. 146).

Research on religion and the Internet has gone through three waves: descriptive studies (focusing on the extraordinary aspects of the Internet), categorical studies (creating categories and typologies for religious expression online), and theoretical studies (incorporating scholarship from different backgrounds, resulting in new themes) (Højsgaard & Warburg, 2005). The current era of research builds off this third wave which further refines and develops methodological approaches for research on religion and the Internet (Campbell, 2013).

Some of these studies on religion and the Internet do not pay attention to the specific platforms used by religious groups to form religious community or circulate religious materials. Often, the media forms are lumped into broader categories of ‘digital media’ or ‘social media’ despite each site or platform functioning in distinct ways, being governed by unique rules and ordered by different codes or structures. My research considers the specificities and material elements of Facebook, particularly Facebook Pages, to explore how specific religious organizations use these platforms.

3.4.3 Christian Perspectives: A Theology of Technology

For Christians, an ethic of how to respond to and use media technologies is found by looking at some unifying guidelines that many Christians agree upon: this forms a “theology of technology”. Theology involves words, teaching or study about god(s), and

questions raised by and about the religions (Ford, 1999). Adding theology brings religious understandings and belief to the mix of ethical thought, to present a way of approaching and using technology in ways that align with God's design for the world. Gladwell (2010) suggests we are experience rich and theory poor; pastor and author Tim Challies (2015) adds we are experience rich and *theology* poor. A "theology of technology" can provide guidance on how Christians (individually and corporately) can respond and use media technologies responsibly and in religious contexts.

A starting point for a Christian theological approach to technology begins with God's cultural mandate to humankind. He directs his creation to "Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28, English Standard Version). The earth is to be filled with more humans, but it should also include products of human culture: books, art, music, tools, and computer technology (Schuurman, 2013). Stephen Monsma (1986) explains how "human beings exercise freedom and responsibility in response to God by forming and transforming the natural creation, with the aid of tools and procedures, for practical ends or purposes" (p. 19). Humans can respond to God's basic instructions of developing resources in the natural world to bring glory to him through human creativity, whether it is designing a plow that can harvest a greater crop or using computer technology to better serve others (Monsma, 1986; Challies, 2015; Schuurman, 2013). Related to media, Schultze & Woods (2008) explain that "Christians are called to faithful media stewardship. Stewards are caretakers of something owned by someone else. Christian stewards take care of media as God's gifts" (p. 29).

Religious groups and institutions will relate to media technologies in varying ways, and these decisions are made in large part because of their underlying theologies

(Lundby, 2013). Each may understand the cultural mandate, but there are still a range of positive and negative views to specific media use. Different writers present the types of people who respond to technology from a similar continuum, with rejection on one end and responsible use on the other. For example, Schuurman (2013) suggests there are four approaches to computer technology: rejection of technology, indifference to technology, embracing technology, and cultivating responsible technology. Similarly, Challies (2015) sees three ways Christians respond to the digital world: strict separation from these technologies and seeing everything digital as a dangerous enemy; embracing the latest technologies enthusiastically and unthinkingly; and the Christian who responds with disciplined discernment. Barbour (1993) also notes three theological responses, as people can view technology as liberator, oppressor or instrument.

On the positive end, Christians see that historically God has worked through different media for His purposes, from the written word and the printing press to new opportunities to reach wider and farther through the Internet. For Christians, there is the potential to use media to glorify God or spread His message to others who have not yet heard the Gospel. Using technology or media in this sense is acceptable and encouraged for the discerning Christian (Challies, 2015) who can cultivate responsible technology (Schuurman, 2013), and thus sees technology as an instrument (Barbour, 1993). Positive appraisals of media use for Christians thus flow from the cultural mandate and from highlighting the benefits of reaching more people with the Gospel. Another direction in the Bible that is informative here is the Great Commission, Jesus' command to his disciples to go and make disciples of all nations. Schultze & Woods (2008) found that evangelicals tend to "praise the new opportunities to spread the Gospel. They see God at

work in emerging innovations. They rave positively about the evangelistic potential” to use media technologies for evangelism, apologetics, and fellowship (p. 137, 140, 282).

Evangelicals can use media for advertising or promotion, and doing so puts technology in a positive light when applied for evangelistic purposes. To move past the language of marketing, some religious groups call typical marketing practices by other names: for example, ‘tithing’ instead of fundraising, and ‘evangelism’ instead of recruitment (Mottner, 2008).

On the other end, technology and media use can be seen quite negatively for Christians: technology could become an idol in our lives (Keller, 2009), it can turn a worship service into pure entertainment, and some claim secular forms of media should be rejected completely (a view taken by Luddites) (Martino, 2013; Stollow, 2005; Challies, 2015). From a negative standpoint, mediated versions are seen as concessions to in-person experiences, whether for relationship building on a one-to-one level (in discipleship and evangelism) or a corporate level for congregational meeting (attending a cyberchurch) (Schultze, 2008; Challies, 2015). As well, negative perceptions of advertising and branding for Christian purposes point out that using the same strategies as businesses and participating in online information sharing has its dangers, downfalls, and is sometimes not needed at all.

3.5 Dialogic Communication

3.5.1 Dialogue

Dialogue involves two people or participants communicating in the same time and same space (Peters, 2006). Kent and Taylor (1998) define dialogic communication as “any negotiated exchange of ideas and opinions” (p. 325). The word “dialogue” combines

“dia” (“through or across”) and “logos” (“word”), meaning dialogue is both “a quality of relationship that arises, however briefly, between two or more people and a way of thinking about human affairs that highlights their dialogic qualities” (Cissna & Anderson, 1998, p. 64). Within dialogue are understandings of how participants approach each other, the consequences of their meeting and the context in which they meet (Cissna & Anderson, 1998).

The first theory developed around dialogic communication comes from the philosopher Martin Buber. For Buber, “communication is about the constitution of relationships, the revelation of otherness” (Peters, 1999, p. 17). In *I and Thou*, Buber (1970) explains that, “dialogue involves an effort to recognize the value of the other – to see him/her as an end and not merely as a means to achieving a desired goal” (p. 53). Dialogue is built on values such as reciprocity, mutuality, involvement, and openness (Kent & Taylor, 2002). To have a dialogic relationship, both communicators must view the goal of their relationship to be communicating with and understanding each other (Kent & Taylor, 1998). Dialogue depends on whether the participants have “in mind the other or others” and intend establishing a living mutual relation between themselves and the other(s) (Buber, 1965, p. 19). He suggests that we view others not as objects but as equals, replacing “I-it” relationships with “I-Thou” ones (Kent & Taylor, 2002; Peters, 1999, p. 19). Buber also considered dialogue as a process of discovering oneself (the I) through understanding and relationship with another (the Thou) (Buber, 1959).

Buber categorizes three kinds of communication: genuine dialogue, where each participant has in mind the other and their well-being; technical dialogue, where the communicative intent is “solely for the purpose of...objective understanding”; and

monologue disguised as dialogue, where each participant speaks with the intent of espousing their point of view, but without the intention of understanding the views or needs of the other party (Arnett, 1986, p. 7). Dialogue's counterpart, monologue, is considered an unethical form of persuasion where the speaker only seeks to be understood and persuade listeners to agree, rather than seeking to understand (Johannesen, 1971).

In this light, dialogue is highly valued. Peters (1999) noted that:

In certain quarters dialogue has attained something of a holy status. It is held up as the summit of human encounter, the essence of liberal education, and the medium of participatory democracy. By virtue of its reciprocity and interaction, dialogue is taken as superior to the one-way communiqués of mass media and mass culture. (p. 33)

The status of dialogue, particularly face-to-face interpersonal dialogic communication, is elevated and regarded as the purest form of communication. However, in-person interactions are not always necessarily dialogic in nature (ex. a scolding or interrogation) and not all communication suggests sustained turn-taking with the aim of mutual understanding (Peters, 2006). Worries about media reducing dialogue and interaction are seen in critiques of media communication, whether they were complaints about writing (seen with Socrates), printing, or computers (Peters, 1999). Media have long served as scapegoats for worries, but the problem is misplaced (Peters, 1999). For example, lack of dialogue on the radio is not due to the technology of the radio itself, but because of other external influences: constituting audiences as observers rather than participants is more profitable (Peters, 1999). We should continue to keep in mind that "dialogue is just one communicative script among many" (Peters, 1999, p. 34).

3.5.2 Dialogue vs. Dissemination (Socrates vs. Jesus)

In his account of the history of communication, *Speaking Into The Air*, John Durham Peters presents a distinction between dialogue and dissemination. He compares Socrates in the *Phaedrus* to Jesus in the synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke), and their preferred mode of communication: Socrates favors dialogue and Jesus favors dissemination (Peters, 1999). By doing so, Peters (1999) explains, “I aim to rediscover both the subtleties of what can count as dialogue and the blessedness of nondialogic forms, including dissemination” (Peters, p. 35).

In Plato’s *Phaedrus* a discussion between Phaedrus and Socrates surrounds human communication, rhetoric, and dialogue. The view here is in favor of dialogue, a true soul-to-soul connection between participants that is interactive, live, unique, and non-reproducible (Peters, 1999). Such vision is sender-oriented, with concern in caring for seeds and proper nurturing by the sender (Peters, 1999). The two modes of distribution (of words, seeds, love), are ones specifically addressed and reciprocal or two-way, and ones that are indifferent to the receiver in one-way form (Peters, 1999). Socrates believes, “it is foolish to indiscriminately scatter words on those who will not know what to do with them” (Peters, 1999, p. 446). This highlights the importance of understanding the subject as the soul, and that “the soul of the speaker and of the hearer need to be closely knitted” (Peters, 1999, p. 45-46).

Plato is writing in the context of a world that is transitioning from orality to literacy (Peters, 1999). The character Socrates complains that writing diminishes memory, lacks interaction, disseminates at random, and disembodies speakers and hearers: all of which are damaging qualities (Peters, 1999). The important thing for

Socrates is the in-person, deep, mutual understanding of the soul of another. In light of this, he claims “communication must be soul-to-soul, among embodied live people, in an intimate interaction that is uniquely fit for each participant” (Peters, 1999, p. 47).

Dissemination, to Socrates, “is ignorant of the soul and careless in distribution” (Peters, 1999, p. 46). The “fertile soil” for him is the soul of a disciple that the teacher can implant his knowledge or “intellectual seeds” into with confidence of how it will be received, a far more durable medium than papyrus (Peters, 1999, p. 48). Socrates is adamant about this: “dialogue (fertile coupling) is the norm; dissemination (spilled seed) is the deviation” (Peters, 1999, p. 49).

Jesus takes a different approach to the ideal mode of communication, still fitting in the rhetoric of sowing and harvesting, but favoring dissemination. Dissemination involves a message being communicated to participants in many times and many spaces (Peters, 2006). The word ‘dissemination’ has Latin roots and indicates the scattering of seeds, drawing similarities among the acts of communication, commerce and sexual reproduction (Peters, 2006). Here there is a delay between casting seeds and the harvest, with uncertain consequences of reception awaiting in the future (Peters, 2006).

This is seen in parables – metaphors carrying a simple story with spiritual or moral lesson (Mirriam Webster Dictionary) – written in the Bible’s Gospels where Jesus addresses the crowd with a message to be heard by anyone of interest (Peters, 1999). Open dissemination is addressed to whom it may concern (no one in particular), with the Word scattered uniformly (Peters, 1999). In this way, dissemination is a receiver-oriented model where the sender has no control over the reception of the message or the harvest of the seeds that are cast out (Peters, 1999). Dissemination is celebrated as desirable in the

parables, distributing in a way that is democratically indifferent to who may receive the message (Peters, 1999). Because there is a loose coupling between the sender and receiver, sower and eventual harvest, the diversity of audience interpretations lack direct interaction (Peters, 1999). Parables are marked by “uniformity in transmission and diversity in reception” so the meaning of the parable is up to the audience who play an active role in interpretation (Peters, 1999).

To present Jesus’ dissemination model, Peters (1999) focuses on a meta-parable of “the parable of the sower” (Peters, 1999, p. 51). This parable calls for a diffuse love that is equally gracious to all (Peters, 1999). Here, broadcasting is celebrated as an equitable mode of communication, with the harvest of meaning up to the recipient (Peters, 1999). In the parable of the sower, a farmer broadcasts seeds everywhere so it lands on different kinds of ground (rocky, thorny, a path) with a range of results: some grow but never bear fruit, some sprout but are scorched by the sun or overcome by weeds, and only a rare few land on fertile, receptive soil that take root and produce abundant fruit (Peters, 1999). In a self-reflexive conclusion to the parable, Jesus says, “He who has ears, let him hear!” (Matthew 13:9, English Standard Version; Peters, 1999, p. 51). Jesus is delivering this parable to a vast and mixed audience of receivers (or “soils”) who may or may not understand the parable’s meaning (Peters, 1999, p. 51). Jesus later shares with his disciples what the parable means: it is about someone who spreads “the word of the kingdom” (Peters, 1999, p. 52). Many will hear the message about the kingdom and have different responses: some will simply not understand it, it may not take deep roots, or it may not be fruitful, but the seed falling on good soil refers to someone who hears the word and understands it, producing a crop (Matthew 13:18-23,

English Standard Version). Jesus here performs a radically public, exoteric mode of dispersing meanings intended for a general audience, favoring relations that are asymmetrical through this mode of address (Peters, 1999).

Throughout this discussion of Socrates' favor of dialogue and Jesus' use of dissemination, Peters (1999) highlights that although dialogue enjoys a highly regarded status, it can also be bad while dissemination can be good. He points out, "one-way communication is not necessarily bad. Reciprocity can be violent as well as fair" (Peters, 1999, p. 56). Peters (1999) suggests that reciprocity needs to operate alongside other principles (since justice demands an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth), and should also include hospitality, gift giving, forgiveness and love. He states, "A life without individuated interaction (dialogue) would lack love; one without generalized access (dissemination) would lack justice" (Peters, 1999, p. 59).

Peters advocates that we consider dissemination as a lens or theory in communication. He acknowledges that dialogue "reigns supreme in the imagination of many as to what good communication might be" (Peters, 1999, p. 26). Peters suggests "dissemination is far friendlier" to the diverse practices we engage in with others (Peters, 1999, p. 62). Dissemination as a model makes more sense practically as well, presenting participants as distant in space and time. Strictly speaking, "no act of communication is ever received in the same space or time as its origin. Even in conversation, there is infinitesimal if imperceptible delay between utterance and audition as the sound waves carry through the air" (Peters, 2006, p. 214). As well, "Most of the human world comes from other times and places than the present moment: broadcasting, attendance, and dissemination are just as crucial sorts of communication as dialogue" (Peters, 2006, p.

214). To normalize dissemination, we can then see other forms of communication as different kinds of dissemination, rather than deformed dialogue (Peters, 2006).

3.5.3 Dialogic Communication in Public Relations

Dialogic communication also has a place in public relations theory and practice, since dialogue and conversation are important for managing customer relations (Kent & Taylor, 2002). The Canadian Public Relations Society (CPRS) defines public relations as “the *strategic management of relationships* between an *organization* and its *diverse publics*, through the use of *communication*, to achieve *mutual understanding*, realize *organizational goals* and serve the *public interest*” (“Mission,” 2008, emphasis in original). The goal of public relations is to “build and then enhance on-going or long-term relationships with an organization’s key constituencies” (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 2). Organizations seek to not only build relationships, but also build a reputation, “guiding what comes to mind when people hear, think or read about an organization” (Kerr, 2008, p. 226). For companies, these types of relationships are multi-faceted as organizations will interact with different publics in different ways (whether they are the customer, or another stakeholder).

There are, of course, standards for public relations practitioners. In Canada, members of the CPRS adhere to a “Code of Professional Standards”. Some of these include: members shall deal fairly and honestly with the communications media and the public, and members shall practice the highest standards of honesty, accuracy, integrity and truth (“Code of professional standards”). These are some ideals to ensure public relations practitioners meet professional standards, as “ethics” is emphasized as a crucial competency for those working in the field (Flynn, 2014). This is especially important as:

“society’s growing demand that organizations be transparent, open, honest, authentic, fair, and socially responsible calls on communicators, as the internal voice and advocate for stakeholders, to work and manage within a high standard of integrity and honesty” (Flynn, 2014, p. 380).

The traditional model of public relations has four parts, including: press agency, public information, two-way asymmetry, and two-way symmetry (Grunig & Hunt, 1984). The first two stages of public relations (press agency and public information) are interested with getting the organization’s point of view out, while the other two (two-way asymmetric and two-way symmetric communication) add an element of concern with the audience’s attitudes and opinions (Johansen, 2001). Dialogue is two-way communication, which is different than one-way communication like an advertisement that does not invite or require a response (Muckensturm, 2013). Symmetry relates to the balance in the relationship, with all actors or persons as equal contributors, providing the same amount of information through an equivalent effort by both parties (Luca, 2011). The two-way symmetrical model (Grunig, 1989) is considered the most ethical, as it fits with Habermas’ (1984) ideal speech situation that emphasizes symmetry and reciprocity.

In light of this, Grunig & Grunig’s (1989; 1992) public relations models state that the two-way symmetrical model emphasizes dialogue and strives for outcomes that mutually benefit the organization and its publics. For communication between organization and publics to be effective, it must be mutual, trustworthy and satisfying, carrying the values of trust and reciprocity (Hon & Grunig, 1999; Kanter & Fine, 2010). Instead of acting solely in the benefit of the organization, a suggested best practice in

public relations includes the audience benefitting as well. This is, however, a time-consuming and dynamic process to create these mutually beneficial relationships.

Especially for non-profit organizations, this can be a challenge. Lovejoy, Waters and Saxton (2012) found that many non-profits believe they do not have the skill, time or resources for the technology and training required to operate dialogic social media. Although these interactions can occur online, social media is merely a tool, and it is the practitioner who creates the dialogue, builds the relationships, and establishes the support between the organization and its constituents (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010). Non-profits that do not attempt two-way communication and focus solely on one-way information delivery may miss the benefits of online dialogic communication to build positive relationships with interested publics and help achieve organizational goals (Keller, 2013).

Grunig & Grunig's (1989; 1992) model presents five principles for dialogic communication: 1) intuitiveness or ease of interface, 2) dialogic loop, 3) usefulness of information, 4) generation of return visits, and 5) the rule of conservation of visitors.

The first principle, intuitiveness or ease of interface relates to the physical design and visitor use with the interface (whether a website or social media page). A visitor should find the site easy to understand, use and navigate to find what they are seeking based on the site's organization (Kent & Taylor, 1998). Sites should provide information as quickly and efficiently as possible (Kent & Taylor, 1998). If it does not, or if the site contains a lot of "fluff" and graphics, then the public may have a negative image of the organization which can cut off opportunities to foster or facilitate dialogic relationship (Kent & Taylor, 1998). With social media sites like Facebook and Twitter (compared to other websites), there is uniformity in their structure and design, so these should be quite

simple for visitors to use if they are familiar with the platform (Muckensturm, 2013).

A second key principle for dialogic communication is the dialogic loop. This principle looks at how new technologies allow feedback from audiences or publics, providing opportunity for visitors to ask questions or pose concerns, and for the organization to respond (Kent & Taylor, 1998). A key here is that the dialogic loop incorporated into the site must be complete, with an individual available to respond to the public's questions and requests in a professional and timely manner (Kent & Taylor, 1998). The aim of this is for communication to be generated and reciprocated by both parties in a symmetrical manner (allowing both organization and visitor to take turns) (Luca, 2011). "Responding" can look different on Facebook than on websites as the organization can "like" a comment by a visitor – this can be considered a form of engagement, or, at the very least, acknowledgement.

Usefulness of information relates to organizations providing useful and trustworthy information that is of general value to all publics, to help visitors be more informed of what the organization does and answer their questions (Kent & Taylor, 1998). To build relationship and have a dialogue, publics come to rely on an organization's site to provide useful and trustworthy information that allows them to engage in dialogue with the organization as an informed partner (Kent & Taylor, 1998). Customers should feel that this information is valuable to them, to answer questions that they may have or spark their interest in a topic (Muckensturm, 2013).

The fourth principle is the generation of return visits, which speaks to the fact that it takes time and repeated encounters to develop relationships with members (Taylor, Kent & White, 2001). Attractive features on the site, such as providing content regularly

with interesting, and interactive information will keep people looking at the page and returning again (Muckensturm, 2013). Features that are suited for repeat visits include updated information, spaces for visitors to have questions answered (ex. forums or FAQs) (Kent & Taylor, 1998), and time-sensitive posts like contests or promotions. If an organization's online presence is well-developed then visitors will be encouraged to be part of the conversation and return to the fan page again (Luca, 2011).

Finally, the rule of conservation of visitors is the fifth principle for dialogic communication. This principle concerns keeping visitors on the organization's page to result in an action or "sale", so organizations should be careful with linking away from the page or the visitor may not return (Kent & Taylor, 1998; Taylor, Kent & White 2001). The organization's website or social media page should not provide an easy way for the visitor to navigate away from the website, and if it does there should be a clearly marked path to get back (Kent & Taylor, 1998).

With each of these principles, the goal is for the organization to have structures in place and content available that invite audiences into dialogic activity. Creating dialogue should be the goal of the interaction, not just a means to an end (as Buber suggested). When using these principles, practitioners should keep the purpose of relationship building in mind.

Although this public relations model has been accepted, used by practitioners, and later applied for researching organizations' communicative actions, this two-way symmetrical model has been criticized. It is seen as too utopian, unrealistic for organizations, and it fails to consider how organizations may use a combination of the four public relations models (Stoker & Tusinski, 2006). Even if an organization engages

in dialogue, other forms of communication can still be used, as “an organization will move between publicity, persuasion and dialogue at various stages of its relationship with stakeholders, and this will shift throughout any long-term relationship” (Theunissen & Wan Noordin, 2010, p. 7).

Further responses to the default two-way symmetrical model in public relations concerns where dissemination, broadcasting, or monologue fits in public relations. The “infatuation” of dialogue in public relations can be challenged by looking to the strengths and limitations of both dialogue and dissemination (Stoker & Tusinski, 2006, p. 156). As Peters (1999) makes clear, dialogue is not always “good” as a balanced, fair approach: dialogue can be selective and controlled, at times it limits participation, and it may only share with whoever is willing to reciprocate (Stoker & Tusinski, 2006). Theunissen & Wan Noordin (2010) take issue with dialogue and persuasion being conceptualized as opposites, because “labeling dialogue as “symmetrical communication” and persuasion as “asymmetric” places persuasion in an inferior position. It advances a progressive linear relationship between the two, i.e. that dialogue necessarily follows persuasion and is “better”” (p. 6). However, dialogue could potentially precede persuasion, and both monologue and dialogue can be requirements for effective public relations (Theunissen & Wan Noordin, 2010, p. 10). This is seen in how dissemination of information can enable awareness and exposure first, before publics and users may respond to an organization (Theunissen & Wan Noordin, 2010).

Similarly, the dichotomy of dissemination vs. dialogue can be seen as problematic when considering specific media forms, particularly with the Internet (Moe, 2008). Large publics can be reached simultaneously with a message via the Internet, so

“as descriptions of communicative forms, neither dissemination nor dialogue is exclusive to any one technology” (Moe, 2008, p. 328). The Internet, typically regarded for its potential for dialogue and two-way interactions between organization and public, can be used for dissemination of information as well. Dissemination is present in a range of online contexts and Internet services that display information for whoever wants to read it: a website’s home page, online news sites, blogs, and web TV services (Moe, 2008). In these cases, the objective is for the sender to disseminate information to “the widest possible circle of readers” (Moe, 2008, p. 327). Instead of only considering the Internet’s potential for dialogue, we should also “acknowledge the potential of online communication’s disseminating features” (Moe, 2008, p. 326).

Another concern with the privileged position of dialogue in public relations is the practicality of dialogue for organizations. Although the goals of two-way symmetrical communication or dialogue are commendable, they are at times unreasonable for organizations (Stoker & Tusinski, 2006). Stoker & Tusinski (2006) argue that “to fulfill Socrates’s expectations for dialogue, an organization would select only publics with which it could successfully communicate”, or ones that would agree with the organization (p. 163). As well, it is difficult for a company or organization to create equality among all parties (various stakeholders) in a dialogic engagement, because organizations will likely be at an advantage through having access to more resources in information and technology (Stoker & Tusinski, 2006), and more control over the communication channel used. One challenge with symmetry (a requirement for achieving dialogue) for an organization is relinquishing control, a barrier which may be difficult or impossible to remove (Theunissen & Wan Noordin, 2010). Considering how to engage

with another in the philosophical sense (i.e., viewing dialogue as a process, not an outcome) would also be challenging for an organization, as stakeholders are often objectified as target audiences for the organization's messages or campaigns, rather than considered active participants (Theunissen & Wan Noordin, 2010, p. 9).

There are also other models that better reflect the contemporary media environment and the nature of public relations today. Flynn & Sévigny (2009) explain,

We have now entered a world of 24/7 news media, omnipresent popular culture and social media delivered straight to our smartphones...Public relations is the profession that brings all of these things together – it is the profession of relationship building, engaging stakeholders to find win/win solutions and facilitating open and honest communication. (p. 10)

Technologies today now enable, or even compel, organizations to be transparent and communicate raw data in real time, and they are obligated to communicate directly with countless stakeholder groups (Flynn, 2006).

Flynn's (2006) balance model is presented to understand the role of the public relations practitioner within the current conditions. Flynn (2014) notes that theory building and empirical research on public relations in Canada has been overshadowed by the dominant, American-centric two-way symmetrical model. Instead, Flynn (2006) suggests we re-conceptualize public relations in a multidimensional perspective, one where "dialogue, collaboration, and negotiation with multiple stakeholders and stakeholders occur simultaneously" (p. 193). The public relations practitioner's new role, then is "to maintain an equilibrium that satisfies the mutual interest of all parties" (Flynn, 2006, p. 193). Flynn (2006) conceptualizes a "balance zone of organizational-public relationship management" which includes a series of continua (mediated to interpersonal, one-way to two-way), the four models of public relations (press agency, public

information, two-way asymmetrical, two-way symmetrical), and various ethical or economic pressures (from advocates, activists, employees, regulators, the media, owners and shareholders) (p. 194-196). This complex environment results in a constant state of engagement between all parties involved, and organizations can achieve their goals by maintaining optimal balance between internal and external interests (Flynn, 2006).

3.5.4 Dialogic Communication in Research

Recent research on dialogic communication online, which examines how relationship building is a key element of public relations, highlights how organizations can make better use of a technology but in a way that also benefits members and stakeholders, not just the organization (Kent, Taylor & White, 2003). Studies have examined different topics and sectors ranging from environmental issues (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009), non-profit organizations (Waters & Jamal, 2011), Fortune 500 companies (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010), educational institutions (Linville, McGee & Hicks, 2012) and even political candidates (Sweetser & Lariscy, 2008).

Interpersonal communication involves conversation between two or more people or users – this can occur in physical co-presence or mediated by technology. Some research has found that relationships developed through computer-mediated communication (CMC) can be as deep and satisfying as those that develop face-to-face, although these take longer to develop (Walther & Burgoon, 1992). Web 2.0 has the capacity to encourage relationships through social networking sites, and organizations can present themselves in a way that opens them up for dialogic communication to establish and maintain these relationships. Smith (2009) suggests that it may be beneficial for organizations to consider listening to consumers as a key part of their business model,

through the “listening economy”. Another way to do this is through audience-centric communications, which can be used to focus less on what the organization wants and more on what the audience wants (Durham, 2010).

Most research analyzing online dialogic communication for organizations finds that non-profit organizations do not take full advantage of all the capabilities possible through social media, observing that many conversations on Facebook Pages are still one-way instead of inviting dialogic communication that social networking sites can make possible (Fussell Sisco & McCorkindale, 2013; Bortree & Seltzer, 2009). Mere presence online is not enough to foster beneficial dialogic communication, although non-profits may have the unique challenge of limited time, resources, and staff skill to facilitate this level of dialogue (Greenberg & Macaulay, 2009; Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Waters et al., 2009; Waters & Jamal, 2011; Waters & Lo, 2012; Paulin et al., 2014). Ingenhoff & Koelling (2007) note: “public relations scholars have pointed out that NPOs are efficiently using the Web to present traditional public relations material, however, without taking advantage of the unique potential of the Internet” (p. 67). This leaves one-way communication as the main use of social media (Keller, 2013). McAllister-Spooner (2009) similarly finds “Web sites are very poorly used dialogic tools, and that organizational Web sites are effectively utilized for introductory level of relationship-building functions. They are easy to use, offer useful information, but they do not do the dialogic functions very well” (p. 321). This suggests that “there is an inconsistency between what practitioners think is possible through the Internet, and what they are actually doing to facilitate relationship-building” (McAllister-Spooner, 2009, p. 321).

Some limitations come up in this research. First, these studies will often make these claims, but not provide suggestions for *how* organizations can improve and implement dialogic principles into their current online communication practices. As well, there are assumptions that this dialogue is beneficial to both organization and site visitors, but it is likely that the organization often benefits by having more supporters, volunteers, and members. Taylor & Kent (2014) also observe: “the biggest flaw in how dialogue has been examined in web-based public relations has involved treating the features of dialogue as a series of categories that had to be present for the potential for dialogue” which is also seen with social media, viewing dialogue as something made possible by Facebook and Twitter (p. 388). The role of the user or public is sometimes forgotten as well, as Kent & Taylor (2014) note, “The mantra that “organizations should engage in dialogue” suggests that when organizations want to dialogue, its publics should be ready to jump up and engage... Yet, in dialogic engagement, the public has an equally important role to play” (p. 394). A final complication here is that figures *suggest*, sometimes mistakenly, that online impressions and engagements automatically translate into support, volunteerism, and membership (which is not necessarily the case).

A question that arises in some of this research is whether social media itself can be considered dialogic, or able to facilitate dialogic communication. In its nature, social media sites like Facebook are not especially dialogic on their own, but have the potential to be (Muckensturm, 2013). In observing how social media has been misused in the non-profit sector, Keller (2013) notes that when a brand invites people to “Like us on Facebook” and “Follow us on Twitter” that “these invitations to friendship inevitably disappoint, when users click on the badge only to find the same static content that is in

the organization's website, newsletters, and Email blasts" (p. 5). This research points to how the tools available for these organizations are not always used to their full benefit, especially when it comes to engaging with key audiences and building mutually beneficial relationships. Such invitations may start appearing promotionally oriented, encouraging users to visit the organization in as many channels of communication as possible and consume their messages in different forms.

Recently, there has been a call for more research into dialogue theory (Taylor & Kent, 2014; Theunissen & Wan Noordin, 2010). It has been nearly 20 years since Kent & Taylor (1998) tried to conceptualize dialogue and public relations and "very little has been added to the discussion of dialogue beyond studies that say web sites and social media are not living up to their dialogic potential" (Taylor & Kent, 2014).

3.6 Addressing the Gap in the Literature

There exists a gap in the current literature linking these areas together for the specific object under study (on-campus Christian non-profit organizations in Canada). Research related to non-profit communication, branding, digital media, social media, and public relations has been done before. However, there is limited literature that examines the intersection of non-profit communication, promotional culture, media and religion and social media. There is no such research that combines these bodies of literature to examine the communication activities of campus ministries in Canada. This thesis examines the communicative conditions in which campus ministries operate and how they use social media to advance their evangelical missions.

I also recognize the need for more critical perspectives of non-profit marketing and public relations, so this project contributes to these approaches. The critical stance I

take has been seen for promotional culture in other areas and contemporary contexts (in Aronczyk & Powers, 2010; Davis, 2013; Powell, 2013), but not with the types of organizations and target audience I am exploring here. In Canada, critical literature and empirical studies on public relations has been considered sparse and “ripe for scholarship and study” (Flynn & Sévigny, 2009, p. 8-9). This project, although not emerging from a public relations graduate program, will still make contributions to this field, especially as the practices of public relations, promotionalism (advertising and marketing), communication metrics (audience and opinion measurement) and journalism seem to be converging in recent years (Sévigny & Flynn, 2011). By linking the various bodies of literature from marketing, non-profit organizations, and public relations in a communications research project, I note how this blending of related fields that draw on similar themes and norms can benefit from understanding bridges between them.

This project questions some of the taken-for-granted assumptions surrounding the use of social media for its potential to reach audiences, or in the case of these campus ministries, student populations. There is less research on social media marketing from a critical media studies perspective that questions the deeper effects of these practices for campus ministries and nonprofit groups more broadly. I suggest that churches and Christian (or other religious) organizations need to carefully reflect on what happens when the messages of the organization are formed with a narrative of promotion.

4 Chapter: Methodology: Analysing Dialogic Communication on Facebook Pages

4.1 Approach and Methodology

This thesis explores dialogic communication used by faith-based non-profits through a content analysis of their Facebook Pages. I examined the official national Facebook Page of four campus ministries: Power to Change – Students, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, The Navigators, and Catholic Christian Outreach. As a sample of the activity for these organizations' Facebook Pages, I observed the posts and comment sections on each Facebook Page from August 1st, 2016 to December 31st, 2016. This serves as an example of one full semester of the 2016-17 school year, as well as the build-up to the start of the academic year.

There is some variation in the size of following for each of these four groups. The Navigators have the smallest following (574 Facebook likes) and post about once a day. IVCF is also on the smaller end (1,864 Facebook likes) and post less frequently (i.e., approximately once or twice a week). The mid-range group here is P2C-S with 4,273 Facebook likes, and post quite frequently, more than once per day. The campus ministry in this selection with the largest following is CCO with 19,724 Facebook likes, also posting more than once per day. These numbers were collected on the first day of coding the posts for the specific campus ministry (Feb 1, 2, or 6, 2017). In light of this, I also expected that the larger following size a campus ministry has on Facebook (number of Page likes), the more dialogic principles will be used overall and with more variety.

I conducted a content analysis of each organization's Facebook posts and comment sections to explore if they use principles of dialogic communication that invite

audience conversation (two-way) or use broadcast-style posts to promote the organization as a brand (one-way). I expected that Canadian campus ministries would employ some principles of dialogic communication, but not use the platform to its full potential to engage with their audiences in this way. The object of analysis here is the posts and comments on the Facebook Page wall or timeline, as this is where dialogic communication can happen (compared to the content on the Page itself that remains relatively static). As well, users cannot comment on the Page, only the wall or the posts. An organization's Facebook posts can vary in content, as it can include copy text, pictures, videos, and links, and also enable different responses by the user to like, comment and share. Recently, Facebook added additional reaction buttons, so as well as "liking" a post, users can also respond with "love", "haha", "wow", "sad", and "angry". There is also opportunity to "like" comments on posts, so when an organization "likes" a user's comment it is also considered a response.

This study builds off of research that applies Kent & Taylor's (1998) five dialogic principles for public relations: 1) intuitiveness or ease of interface, 2) dialogic loop, 3) usefulness of information, 4) generation of return visits, and 5) the rule of conservation of visitors. These guidelines for strategic communication were inspired by Grunig and Grunig's (1989; 1992) public relations models, which states the two-way symmetrical model emphasizes dialogue and strives for outcomes that mutually benefit the organization and its publics. These dialogic measures have been applied to analyze non-profit website use (Taylor, Kent & White, 2001; Kent, Taylor & White, 2003; Smith, 2007) and have been adapted for non-profit social media use, which my measures are based (Greenberg & Macaulay, 2009; Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010;

Waters et al., 2009; Waters & Jamal, 2011; Waters & Lo, 2012; Paulin et al., 2014).

To build on this research, I added further measures to explore the nature of the dialogue taking place by analyzing the comments on the posts as well. This project is also interested in what is considered dialogic engagement itself and questions if any form of dialogue (two-way communication) will necessarily contribute to developing a relationship. What qualifies as “dialogue”? Is it the reciprocal, back-and-forth nature of communication? Does the mere fact of having an interaction between organization and public counts as dialogue, or does the nature of the interaction need to go deeper than simply “liking” a comment or providing a quick fact? The content analysis thus included additional elements focusing specifically on the comments of the posts being analyzed and the dialogic interactions taking place, with criteria for ‘information exchange’ and ‘engaging conversation’ to further interrogate what dialogue in these settings looks like. I expected there to be dialogue taking place through both forms of dialogic interaction, but for there to be some posts with no comments at all, and of the posts that did have comments the criteria for ‘engaging conversation’ would not always be present. This is partly because of the amount of time required to build meaningful relationships with audiences online and the effort needed by both user and organization to continue a conversation on a single post.

By looking at the styles of communication used by campus ministries in these online spaces, I consider whether non-profits are more promotionally oriented or if they invite and engage in dialogic communication with their online audiences. If these non-profit organizations appear more promotionally oriented (by using one-way communication), that will speak to the ways this sector borrows from for-profit

organizations in online marketing efforts. Examining the language used in Facebook posts to brand or position these non-profits can reflect how those behind the online presence view their students or members as an audience. As well, noting the content of the dialogic communication taking place is important to recognize, as this project seeks to add further layers to online dialogic communication research. It is hoped that the findings of this study will be useful and applicable for other organizations, whether for-profit or non-profit, religiously oriented or not.

4.2 Rationale for Sample Selection

The four campus ministries (P2C-S, IVCF, The Navigators, and CCO) have been chosen to analyse in this project because of their similarities in size, mission and vision, and organizational structure. Other religiously oriented groups exist on college and university campuses across Canada, whether belonging to other religions (ex. Muslim Students Association), a special interest (ex. Athletes in Action), or an ethnic/cultural group (ex. Chinese Christian Fellowship), but to compare across these sub-categories within faith-based campus clubs is beyond the scope of this project. Comparisons could be made between Protestant evangelical groups and Catholic groups, but here they are considered part of the same overarching religiously affiliated category of “Christian”. P2C-S, IVCF, The Navigators, and CCO were chosen as general-interest Christian campus ministries with a presence on campuses across the country in Western Canada, Atlantic Canada, Ontario, and Quebec (“Find my campus”; “Find us”; “Map”; “Campuses,” CCO). All of these campus ministries also have an online presence, understandably so as they want to be discoverable for Canadian post-secondary students and engage with their audiences where they spend time.

To show a range of ministry sizes and explore the varieties in communication style (instrumental/one-way or dialogic/two-way), these four campus ministries also serve as a good selection. There is a range of following size (Facebook likes) for under 1,000 (Navigators), between 1,000-10,000 (IVCF, P2C-S) and over 10,000 (CCO). As well, there is variation in posting frequency at once or twice a week (IVCF), once a day (Navigators), and multiple times a day (P2C-S and CCO). These differences were considered in the data analysis and discussion that follows.

4.3 Rationale for Facebook Pages

Facebook Pages were selected for analysis for a variety of reasons. To start, P2C-S, IVCF, Navigators, and CCO all use a Facebook Page, but not every group actively uses Instagram, YouTube, Twitter, or a blog, thus Facebook Pages are used as a fairer comparison across the sample. As well, the campus ministry's national Facebook Pages were chosen instead of local chapter Facebook Pages or groups because the official Pages give an example of the communication strategies used by the organization as a whole. Local campus ministry Pages would include too much variation by campus, those managing the Pages may be a student volunteer instead of a trained staff on the communications team, and the level of individualization of each would make it difficult to generalize for the national ministry's brand presence and communication methods.

Additionally, Facebook Pages were chosen as the social media channel to analyze because of the significant role they play for marketers in all fields and sectors. According to a study by Social Media Examiner, upwards of 93% of social media marketers use Facebook, 55% of marketers selected Facebook as their most important platform, and 86% say they regularly use Facebook ads (Stelzner, 2016). Facebook has now become

the biggest relationship-marketing provider for many brands (Neff, 2010). Using Facebook in marketing is significant, seen in both for-profit and non-profit sectors.

As well, recent research on dialogic communication on the Internet for non-profit organizations has used Kent & Taylor's (1998) five dialogic principles to analyse organization's websites, which has also been adapted to research organization's social networking sites (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010). Considering where marketing teams are putting effort and resources, social media pages were also chosen because some brands get more traffic on their Facebook Page than their website and have shifted their efforts to Facebook advertising campaigns (Neff, 2010).

Social media pages are arguably more oriented to allow dialogic communication compared to websites, as they are posted to more frequently (sometimes multiple times in one day) and invite comments and feedback in a more visible way than websites do. In 1998, Kent & Taylor noted, "The Web has great potential as a dialogic communication medium" (p. 331). Today, at first glance social networking sites seem to hold some of the greatest potential out of the available options online for organizations to utilize in building relationships with its publics, as the organization can reach out to users and give them feedback with the click of a button. Posting comments and asking questions can be quite a simple action for a visitor. When an organization has a Facebook Page, they are opening themselves up for visitors to respond, inquire, rank, and give feedback in a public way for other visitors to see. Websites and blogs will sometimes have space for visitors to ask questions, leave comments, or send a message to someone on the other end, but often these are more hidden. Since social networking sites encourage making connections with other users, it is understandable that these platforms could be used for

dialogic, back-and-forth conversation and communication (even between organization and user). The concern, though, is how deep these relationships are and if any connection at all counts as building a relationship (ex. the user “liking” a post). Some of these positive qualities can be speculated, but in terms of selecting Facebook Pages over websites, these are the reasons why organizations may favour social media sites for publicly engaging with their audiences out of their available options online.

4.4 Criteria for Each Dialogic Principle on Social Media

The criteria used for each dialogic principle draws upon previous research that examines organizations’ use of social media pages for public engagement. Through a content analysis of the four campus ministries’ Facebook Pages, data is categorized into four principles of dialogic communication as either present or not: dialogic loop, usefulness of information, generation of return visits, and conservation of visitors (Kent & Taylor, 1998). The fifth dialogic principle “intuitiveness or ease of interface” was omitted from the study. This is guided by other studies of dialogic communication on social media that note Facebook Pages are consistent in their design and navigation, with only some opportunity to personalize the Page (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010; Linvill, McGee, & Hicks 2012). These social media pages are structurally the same, so although an organization can make small modifications (change profile picture and cover photo, or edit information in the “About” section), the general layout and design of the Page remains the same for all organizations (Muckensturm, 2013). Therefore, even though this principle is useful for analyzing websites, it is not as useful when looking at social media sites.

The coding sheet in Appendix A was divided into four principles: dialogic loop,

usefulness of information, generation of return visits, and conservation of visitors. I further modified and added criteria to these principles to fit the social media pages under analysis here. Examples of the criterion for each principle are described in the following sections to clarify which criteria included what types of posts. Tables are provided of the criteria for each principle below and in Appendix A. I met with my thesis supervisor to review and approve the coding framework used to analyze these four dialogic principles and their specific criteria.

4.4.1 Criteria Used for the Dialogic Loop Principle

The dialogic loop principle looks at how organizations allow feedback from audiences or publics, providing opportunity for them ask questions and for the organization to respond (Kent & Taylor, 1998). “Responding” can look different on Facebook than on websites as the organization can “like” a comment by a visitor, which can be considered a form of engagement and acknowledgement. Criteria for the dialogic loop includes: providing opportunity for the audience to respond; responding to a question; responding to a complaint; and responding to or “liking” a comment (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010; Muckensturm, 2013). With the first criteria, providing opportunity for the audience to respond, if a question was included in the post it is only coded as “1” for “present” if the question clearly invites users to give a response or leave a comment. If a question is included to intrigue the audience to get them to click the link or continue reading, it is not inviting the audience to respond. As well, if the organization responds to or “likes” any comment on the post (not necessarily all of the comments), the criteria is considered present. A question would involve a clear ask from a user (ex. “What’s the promo code?” or “Is there more to the video?”) but a concern could be stated more

generally (ex. “The video isn’t working for me.” or “The book isn’t free. Only a chapter is.”). Below are further examples of the criteria used.

Table 1 Examples of Criteria for Dialogic Loop Principle

Providing opportunity for the audience to respond (ex. posing a question)	Power to Change - Students September 20, 2016 · 🌐 <p>Have you been a part of reaching East Asia these last twenty years? Leave us a comment and share a story. Sharing is caring... and it can inspire more students to participate in #P2CGlobalMissions</p>
Responding to a user’s question	Sam · 17:26 Is session 2 posted? Like · Reply · 1 · December 29, 2016 at 4:06pm Catholic Christian Outreach · 22:20 Sam Hey Sam, it was recorded live, but not yet posted, we'll let you know when it's published. Like · Reply · 3 · December 29, 2016 at 4:12pm
Responding to a user’s complaint or concern	<p>FREE DOWNLOAD from Being There: How to Love Those Who Are Hurting</p> <p>Ever wondered how to truly love those who are hurting? Then get this free download from Being There: How to Love Those Who Are Hurting.</p> <p>VERGENETWORK.ORG</p> <p>Like · Comment · Share</p> <p>Top Comments</p> <p>Write a comment...</p> <p> Joseph the book isn't free. a Chapter is, but you still have to buy the entire book if you want to read the rest of it. 😞 Like · Reply · November 1, 2016 at 10:17pm · Edited</p> <p> The Navigators of Canada Sorry about that Joseph. Hopefully there's still some good stuff in that chapter Like · Reply · November 1, 2016 at 10:19pm</p> <p> Joseph The Navigators of Canada Well, it is the first chapter. so at least it doesn't drop you in somewhere and risk some loss of context.</p>
Responding to or “liking” a user’s comment	<p> The Navigators of Canada likes this. the ultimate disciple-maker. He is our first</p> <p>Like · Reply · 1 · December 27, 2016 at 10:09am</p> <p> The Navigators of Canada Yes indeed Ray. It can be easy to get caught up in the latest trends, but it's always worth going back to the source</p> <p>Like · Reply · 1 · December 27, 2016 at 10:12am</p>

4.4.2 Criteria Used for the Usefulness of Information Principle

The principle of usefulness of information relates to organizations providing useful and trustworthy information, to help visitors be more informed of what the organization does, and answer their questions in order to build relationship and have a

dialogue (Kent & Taylor, 1998). Some of these features include: links to outside sources; photos, videos, and other multimedia; providing company information; providing contact information; and providing information on the organization's products, services or events (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010; Luca, 2011; Muckensturm, 2013). An outside source is considered a website, blog/article, or Facebook Page that is not specifically belonging to or affiliated with the organization. Photos are only coded as "present" when they are clearly photos, not an image appearing in a link preview. If the post involves the organization adding photos to a photo album, the most recently occurring post is coded, and other copies of this post are not (because the post would have the same number of comments and would be repeated in coding). Other multi-media are included based on what the campus ministries provide on their Pages (e.g., podcasts and GIFs were present with P2C-S). Company information relates to details about the national ministry, including historical or archival data, information on the organization's founders or directors, or relating to the ministry's mission or vision. Information on products, services, or events includes any basic details or information on campus locations, mission trips, or organization-specific events, as well as products available in their online store. Below are further examples of the criteria used.

Table 2 Examples of Criteria for Usefulness of Information Principle

<p>Links to outside sources (other websites, blogs, articles, Facebook Pages) that are <i>not</i> the campus ministry's</p>	<div data-bbox="812 254 1380 840"> <p>The Navigators of Canada August 19, 2016 · 🌐</p> <p>In the plethora of online social spheres we regularly plug into, how can we be more like Jesus to those we interact with?</p> <p>To get you started, here are eight ideas, courtesy of RELEVANT Magazine. What others do you think should be added to this list? Let us know in the comments below.</p> <p>8 Things Christians Need to Do More on Social Media The internet doesn't have to be a terrible place. RELEVANTMAGAZINE.COM</p> </div>
<p>Photos, videos and other multimedia (ex. podcasts, GIFs)</p>	<div data-bbox="795 882 1396 1260"> <p>Catholic Christian Outreach added 679 new photos from December 2016 to the album: RISE UP Vancouver 2016 — with Eric Filion and 10 others at The Westin Bayshore. December 2016 · 🌐 · 📷</p> <p>Rise Up is a conference for young adults hosted by Catholic Christian Outreach, a Canadian university student movement – but Rise Up is more than a conference. It exists to motivate and inspire leaders for the renewal of the world.</p> </div>
<p>Providing company information</p>	<div data-bbox="812 1302 1380 1701"> <p>Power to Change - Students October 6, 2016 · 🌐</p> <p>#TBT - This year marks the 20th anniversary of our partnership in East Asia. Over time, we have seen hundreds of young Canadians bringing the light of the gospel to this region. We have seen God working in incredible ways -- seeing East Asian students come to faith, growing the underground church, and raising up East Asian missionaries to go into the least reached peoples in the world! Will you join... See More — with Betty Lau, Rod Alm, Dorrie Manu, Peggy Yuan Porter and Graham Watt.</p> </div>

Providing contact information	<p>Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada shared Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship - IVCF at UVIC's photo. September 5, 2016 · 🌐</p> <p>Come Join the Movement! Everyone Welcome! Find us online and at clubs days for more info on Kick off events</p> <p> intervarsityuvic @uvicivcf Main Contact: mchurch@ivcf.ca </p> <p>Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship - IVCF at UVIC September 4, 2016 · 🌐 Like Page</p>
Providing information on the organization's products, services, or events	<p> The Navigators of Canada October 20, 2016 · 🌐</p> <p>A chill is in the air, and we all know what that means.... It's time to layer up with your own Navigator sweater! Available in a wide variety of colours, these sweaters are an excellent way to stay warm and show your Navigator pride! Get yours here: http://navresources.ca/product_details.php...</p>

4.4.3 Criteria Used for the Generation of Return Visits Principle

The generation of return visits principle speaks to the fact that it takes time and repeated encounters to develop relationships with members (Taylor, Kent & White, 2001). Features that are attractive for repeat visits include updated information, spaces for visitors to have questions answered (Kent & Taylor, 1998), as well as time-sensitive posts such as contests or promotions. Criteria considered here include: contests; inviting the user to register, apply, or donate; promotions or discounts; and asking the audience to share a post (Muckensturm, 2013). Inviting the user to register, apply, or donate could contain a direct statement or include vague language such as “applications,” “join us,” “support,” or “get your tickets”. Similarly, asking the audience to share a post could be said explicitly or with similar language, for example “who could you share this with?”. Below are further examples of the criteria used.

Table 3 Examples of Criteria for Generation of Return Visits Principle

Contests
Inviting user to register, apply, or donate
Promotions or discounts
Asking the audience to share a post (or similar language)

4.4.4 Criteria Used for the Conservation of Visitors Principle

The conservation of visitors principle concerns keeping visitors on the organization's Page to result in an action or "sale", so organizations should be careful

with linking away from the Page or the visitor may not return (Kent & Taylor, 1998; Taylor Kent & White, 2001). Providing content regularly will keep people looking at the Page, so criteria for this principle includes: links to the organization’s other social media profiles, blog, or website; asking the audience to “like” a post; and regular posts to the Page (Rbalko & Seltzer, 2010; Muckensturm, 2013). Linking to the organization’s other social media pages or websites would include any link directly affiliated with the organization, for example a local campus ministry’s Facebook Page. Regular posting to the Page is considered three posts per week. This is measured by recording the date of every post analyzed, then consulting a calendar for the dates of each week from Sunday to Saturday. Any posts that are part of a week that contained 3 posts or more is coded “present” for regular posts to the Page. Below are further examples of the criteria used.

Table 4 Examples of Criteria for the Conservation of Visitors Principle

Links to the organization’s other social media profiles, blog, or related website
Asking the audience to “like” a post
Regular posts to the Page	>3 posts in one week

4.5 Criteria for Dialogic Interaction in Comments

As well as exploring the dialogic principles used in these organization’s Facebook posts, this research is also concerned with the content of the comments on these posts to see how different users are interacting and engaging with the organization on their social

media pages. By further analyzing the comments on these posts and interrogating what qualifies as dialogue, I hope to get a better sense of the content of the interactions taking place between organization and user. By categorizing the content of the user's comments into two forms of dialogic interaction ('information exchange' and 'engaging conversation') this research reveals which specific modes of address are used in the interactions happening on Facebook posts in the comments. The coding framework to analyze these criteria was reviewed and approved by the researcher's supervisor.

4.5.1 Criteria Used for Information Exchange

'Information exchange' posts would involve a simple sharing of facts or basic information. The criteria included in coding for this are: the user asking a question about the information found in the post; the user asking a question about the organization; and the user tagging another user in the comments (for them to see the post and share that information with another). Sometimes, when a user tags another user, they are doing the work for the organization in further promoting what the organization's post is about (ex. tagging someone you want to apply to go on a mission trip). Below are further examples of the criteria used.

Table 5 Examples of Criteria for Information Exchange in Comments

<p>User asking a question or raising concern about information in the post</p>	<p>Evangelina I live in Vancouver. So, I want to know the price for each day separately. Thanks Like · Reply · November 12, 2016 at 1:31pm</p> <p>Catholic Christian Outreach Hi Evangelina, glad to hear you're interested in attending! Day passes will go on sale Nov 16, after the deadline. Keep an eye on http://cco.ca/riseup/details/</p> <p>Rise Up Details Rise Up is a conference for young adults (aged 18-35) hosted by Catholic Christian Outreach, a... CCO.CA</p> <p>Like · Reply · November 12, 2016 at 2:33pm</p> <p>Evangelina Please send me link when the tickets will be available. Thanks Like · Reply · November 16, 2016 at 9:51am</p> <p>Catholic Christian Outreach Hi Evangelina. Day passes are now available at https://www.cvent.com/.../registration... We look forward to having you join us! Like · Reply · 1 · November 16, 2016 at 2:37pm</p>
<p>User asking a question or raising concern about the organization</p>	<p>Bob Are you still allowed in the public high schools? In the USA, atheists often try to stop Christian clubs in the schools. I remember IVCF had a club in the 1960's in the Lakefield High School I attended at the time (although I didn't go to the IVCF). Like · Reply · August 31, 2016 at 4:08pm</p> <p>Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada In Canada we are still allowed in public high schools. We have always done this through the sponsorship of a teacher who works in the school. Like · Reply · August 31, 2016 at 4:22pm</p>
<p>User tagging another user or Facebook Page in the comments</p>	<p>Eric Andrew Ahtisham Sabreen what are you guys thinking? Call me or send a message and let me know! Like · Reply · 1 · November 15, 2016 at 12:11pm</p> <p>Cameron D'Arcy Linus check your Van friends are on it!. Maire let's go on this adventure! Bee have we missed anyone? Daniel you know someone who should be here? Like · Reply · 2 · November 15, 2016 at 9:44pm</p> <p>Bee Translated from French Last chance at this price! 😊 last chance at this price! Don't miss it, it will be awesome! You don't want to miss it, it'll be awesome! 😊 Elizabeth Robyn Alyson Evelyn Sandy Sophie Kristyn Laurie Maya Miriam Sara-Ann Caleb Alex Jessica Marta Nicholas See Original Like · Reply · November 15, 2016 at 9:56pm</p>

4.5.2 Criteria Used for the Engaging Conversation

‘Engaging conversation’ is categorized as the kind of interactions that facilitate more significant conversation and the potential for more meaningful relationship development. The criteria here include: the user thanking the organization for the post (or a user in the post); the user agreeing with or supporting the organization (could involve the user saying they are praying); and the user contributing something new or sharing

their personal thoughts and experiences. I did not expect long conversations to take place in the comments on these Facebook posts, but recognizing these elements that are getting more personal or deeper than simply sharing information are criteria that demonstrate the more real connections that can be made between user and organization. Below are further examples of the criteria used.

Table 6 Examples of Criteria for Engaging Conversation in Comments

User thanking the organization for the post	Theo Whoa! Talk about a response to a prayer! Definitely well needed in this moment! Thank you for sharing! Like · Reply · 3 · November 15, 2016 at 10:52am
User agreeing with or supporting the organization	Courtney Amazing! God bless you! Like · Reply · 1 · December 6, 2016 at 8:19pm Suzy Beautiful testimony! Like · Reply · December 6, 2016 at 8:46am
User contributing something new or sharing their personal thoughts and experiences related to the post	Edward Please keep sharing these success stories it warms the heart. Where were you guys when I was in university and heading in the wrong direction? It took me twenty years to find my way. Like · Reply · 2 · December 6, 2016 at 9:05am · Edited

4.6 Coding Procedures

To answer RQ1 (What style(s) of communication do campus ministries use on their Facebook Pages: one-way (instrumental) or two-way (dialogic)?) each of the four campus ministries' Facebook Pages were analyzed. All of the timeline (wall) posts from August 1st, 2016 to December 31st, 2016 (n=812) were analyzed for the four principles, as present or not, then comment sections (n=233) were analyzed for the two forms of dialogic interaction, as present or not. An excel document was created to put the date and copy text from the posts examined. See Appendix C for Facebook Page URLs.

A list of criteria for each dialogic principle was coded as present ("1" for "yes") or absent ("0" for "no"). In analyzing this, "yes" demonstrates dialogic communication and "no" demonstrates more promotionally oriented language. Many of these measures

look for different ways of engaging with the audience over time to develop relationships, rather than broadcasting a message for one-time use.

In analyzing the comments on the post, a list of criteria for ‘information exchange’ and ‘engaging conversation’ were coded as present (“1” as “yes”) or absent (“0” as “no”). In analyzing this, ‘information exchange’ would be considered more instrumental and shallow, and ‘engaging conversation’ would demonstrate more effort by the organization to provide content and spaces for users to be interacting with the organization online in a more personal and meaningful way. This further explores what dialogic communication on Facebook posts looks like, and whether it appears to be facilitating engaging conversation or is a simple instrumental information exchange.

Before analyzing the posts for the selected time frame, a test coding was done for CCO’s Facebook posts and comments in January 2017. This was to further clarify the criteria being coded, and to give more examples of what elements could be found in criteria. Test coding took place in February 2017, at least one full month after the last post considered for analysis (December 31st, 2016). By this time, it is likely that users would no longer comment on these posts and the Page administrators would not make edits to the post. While coding, I noted interesting posts, comments, and trends, taking screen shots to provide examples of the criteria being analyzed.

A few other observations were made throughout the coding process related to the user’s position and the administrator’s privileged position, in terms of what was visible. As a researcher without administrator privileges, I was unable to see all of the “shares” on a post because of other users’ privacy settings. Any comments made on the shared posts were not considered, only those comments appearing on the original post found on

the organization's Facebook Page. With advertisements, a Facebook user can see if a post is "Sponsored" (i.e., a paid advertisement) or is an organic, unpaid, regular post to the Page. If the post is paid for, Facebook's algorithm will cause it to appear differently for each user in their News Feed, which may then impact the number of people liking, sharing and commenting on it. These ads may be shown to users in their News Feed or on the sidebar, rather than appearing as a post to the organization's Page. In this project no distinction is made between paid advertisements and unpaid posts, so any post appearing on the Page was considered equally (this would exclude ads that appear to users on the "Sponsored" sidebar). Another power that is only possible for Page administrators is the option for the Page to respond privately. If a user comments on a post, the administrator can send a personal message, which moves the public conversation to a place where other users cannot see. These private conversations, if they occurred, are also not included in the analysis.

4.7 Researcher Standpoint and Perspective

It should be acknowledged that the researcher has been personally involved with one of the campus ministries being studied (Power to Change – Students) as a student connected to a local campus ministry, a volunteer for some events, and a short-term staff member on the organization's Creative Communications team (May to August 2016). Although I was more familiar with this campus ministry's work, and contributed to the social media posts created during my employment in 2016, I maintained a critical ethical distance from the subject of study and analyzed all of the organizations equally. My perspective of campus ministries may be shaped primarily by my experience with Power to Change – Students, but I ensured that all campus ministries in this study were given

equal attention and that the analysis was based on what was observed from their Facebook posts and interactions with their online audiences, not influenced by previous experience with the organization.

5 Chapter: Results and Discussion: Campus Ministries Caught in Promotional Culture

5.1 Results

This thesis examined four Canadian campus ministries' Facebook Pages in relation to four of Kent and Taylor's (1998) dialogic principles: dialogic loop, usefulness of information, generation of return visits, and conservation of visitors. Second, comment sections were further analyzed to examine two versions of dialogic interaction: 'information exchange' and 'engaging conversation'. A total of 812 Facebook posts and 233 comment sections were examined. The posts and comments were not mutually exclusive, as more than one dialogic principle could be found in each post, and criteria from both 'information exchange' and 'engaging conversation' could be seen in the same comment or comment section.

Across the campus ministries, there was variation in the number of posts per month. Over the five month study period, the total number of Facebook posts per campus ministry were as follows: 165 for Navigators, 45 for IVCF, 378 for P2C-S⁵ and 224 for CCO. Instead of comparing frequency of dialogic principle use in absolute numbers (simply counting the number of times the principle occurred), percentages were used for a fairer comparison (found by adding the total number of posts that each dialogic principle was present in and dividing it by the total number of posts).

⁵ Since I worked for P2C-S from May to August, 2016, it was also noted which posts were either created or influenced by the researcher. These posts were found in P2C-S's posts in August 2016, part of September 2016, and a few more throughout the semester. The researcher helped create a total of 59 posts for P2C-S, or 15.6% of all posts for the months of August to December, 2016.

5.1.1 Results for the Four Dialogic Principles

Do campus ministries engage in one-way (instrumental) or two-way (dialogic) communication using social media? Figure 1 illustrates the frequency that each dialogic principle occurred throughout all the posts collected in all four campus ministries. Conservation of visitors was the principle that occurred most often at 99.3%. Usefulness of information appeared second most often at 90.3%. Less frequently seen were dialogic loop at 28.5% and lastly generation of return visits at 21.3%.

Figure 1 Percent of Dialogic Principles Used in Total Facebook Posts

To understand the significance of these figures, the dialogic principles can be further explored by examining each criterion. The frequency of each criterion within each principle is demonstrated in Figure 2. The top criteria used was posting regularly (three times a week), which occurred in 97.7% posts. Other frequently occurring criteria seen in all campus ministries was using photos, videos or other multimedia (63.4%), giving information on products or events (59.9%), and including links to the organization's other social media profiles or website (57.0%). All four of these frequently occurring criteria belong to the dialogic principles "conservation of visitors" and "usefulness of information".

Principles occurring the least frequently (in less than 1% of posts) were: responding to a complaint (0.5%), giving contact information (0.5%), running contests (0.6%), and asking the audience to “like” the post (0.7%). These least frequently occurring criteria are found across all four dialogic principles: dialogic loop, usefulness of information, generation of return visits, and conservation of visitors. This is interesting to note, that although two dialogic principles were seen more frequently overall (usefulness of information and conservation of visitors), there are still specific criteria that rarely occur through all four dialogic principles.

Figure 2 Criteria for Dialogic Principles Appearance as Percentage within Total Posts

Since the posts were not mutually exclusive it is important to note what percent of posts met at least one dialogic principle. Figure 3 demonstrates that all posts used at least

one dialogic principle. 8.4% of all posts used only 1 principle of dialogic communication. Posts that included two dialogic principles were most common (51.2% of posts), and a further 33.1% of posts used three dialogic principles. Only 7.3% of all posts made use of all four dialogic principles in a single post.

Figure 3 Number of Dialogic Principles Used Per Post

Figure 4 illustrates the percentage of each criterion occurring within each dialogic principle. Within dialogic loop, the criteria used most often were responding to or “liking” a comment (47.6%) and posting a question or inviting comments (47.2%). The other two criteria within dialogic loop (responding to a question or complaint) were seen much less frequently (1.6% and 3.5% respectively). Usefulness of information was mostly seen through using photos, videos or other multimedia (40.3%) or giving information on products or events (38.1%) while giving contact information was rarely seen (only 0.3% of posts including this principle). Generation of return visits consisted heavily of inviting users to register, apply or donate (75.2%) with running promotions or discounts making up almost the rest (18.1%). The fourth dialogic principle, conservation of visitors, was also heavily made up of one criteria, posting regularly at 62.8%, with

almost the rest found in links to the organization’s other social media or website (36.7%) and very few posts asking the audience to “like” it (0.5%).

Figure 4 Criteria for Dialogic Principles Appearing as Percentage within Each Principle

The research also examined the use of criteria within each principle. The first dialogic principle is the dialogic loop. Examples of each criterion for this principle are shown in Appendix A. Total frequencies for the dialogic loop (see Figure 5) of all campus ministries together showed that responding to or “liking” a comment was most common within this principle (47.6%), closely followed by posing a question or inviting user comments (47.2%). Occurring less often were responding to a question (3.5%) and

responding to a complaint (1.6%), likely because there were overall fewer questions and complaints on the posts compared to more general comments.

Figure 5 Percentage of Criteria Used in Dialogic Loop

The second dialogic principle is usefulness of information. Examples of each criterion for this principle are shown in Appendix A. Figure 6 below shows that including photos, videos, or other multimedia occurred most often (63.4%) followed by information on products or events (59.9%), links to outside sources (20.9%), and company information (12.6%). The criteria that was rarely found in the posts analyzed was providing contact information at 0.5%.

Figure 6 Percentage of Criteria Used in Usefulness of Information

The third dialogic principle is the generation of return visits. Examples of each criterion for this principle are shown in Appendix A. Figure 7 below shows that the most frequent criteria for this dialogic principle was inviting the audience to register, apply, or donate (in 19.5% of all posts). Occurring less often were promotions or discounts (4.7%), asking the user to “share” the post (1.1%) and lastly running contests (0.6%).

Figure 7 Percentage of Criteria Used in Generation of Return Visits

The fourth and final dialogic principle considered is conservation of visitors. Examples of each criterion for this principle are shown in Appendix A. Figure 8 below illustrates that posting regularly occurred in 97.7% of all posts examined. Organizations included links to their other social media pages or website in 57.0% of posts. The criteria appearing least often in this principle was asking the audience to “like” the post at 0.7%.

Figure 8 Percentage of Criteria Used in Conservation of Visitors

Although it is meaningful to look at the use of dialogic principles by all of the campus ministries in this study, it is also important to note the differences between them. There was variation in campus ministry following numbers (number of people who like the Facebook Page) and frequency of posting (the total number of posts analyzed) which seems to be correlated with a variation in use of dialogic principles. A review of the range in following size with Facebook likes is: under 1,000 (Navigators), between 1,000-10,000 (IVCF, P2C-S) and over 10,000 (CCO). Variation in posting frequency includes: once or twice a week (IVCF), once a day (Navigators), and multiple times a day (P2C-S and CCO).

Figure 9 below demonstrates the varying ways dialogic principles were used by each campus ministry. Generally, both the principles for usefulness of information and conservation of visitors were seen most frequently in all four campus ministries, ranging from using the principle in 82%-100% and 88.9%-100% of the organization's posts respectively. The other two principles, dialogic loop and generation of return visits, had more variation. IVCF only used the principle dialogic loop in 6.7% of posts while the other three campus ministries used it between 24.8% and 33.9% posts. Similarly,

Navigators used the generation of return visits in 10.3% of posts, but the other three campus ministries used it in 20.6%-29.9% of posts.

Figure 9 Percentage of Dialogic Principles Used in Total Posts Across Campus Ministries

More detailed differences across campus ministries can be seen in analyzing the criteria for each principle used by each campus ministry. Figures 10, 11, 12, and 13 illustrate these differences. Compared across the four campus ministries, it is clear that IVCF is not employing the dialogic loop principle the same way as the other campus ministries (see Figure 10). IVCF posed questions or invited audience comments in only 2.2% of posts, and responded to or “liked” a comment in only 2.2% of posts. The other campus ministries posed questions between 14.6% and 17.6% of posts, and responded to comments in 8.5%-20.1% of posts. IVCF also responded to a question more frequently than the other campus ministries, although this was seen in only 4.4% of their posts.

Figure 10 Percentage of Criteria Used in Dialogic Loop Across Campus Ministries

The second dialogic principle is usefulness of information. Here again we note some differences across campus ministries. Figure 11 demonstrates that the Navigators seem to use the criteria of this principle differently than the other three. The Navigators include links to outside sources more frequently than the other campus ministries (56.4% of their posts), and include information on their products or events much less often (only 3.6% of their posts). Another trend to note is that of the two most frequently used criteria, CCO uses them most frequently compared to the other organizations: CCO includes photos, videos or other multimedia in 88.8% of their posts and information on their products or events in 81.7% of their posts.

Figure 11 Percentage of Criteria Used in Usefulness of Information Across Campus Ministries

The third dialogic principle is the generation of return visits. Examining the frequency of criteria use across the campus ministries shows a few small differences (Figure 12). Some of the criteria were not used by certain campus ministries at all: contests were only seen with P2C-S but not Navigators, IVCF, or CCO; and asking users to “share” the posts was used by Navigators, IVCF, and P2C-S but not CCO. Even though CCO does not use either of these criteria, they do take the lead on asking users to register, apply or donate, seen in 29.0% of their posts.

Figure 12 Percentage of Criteria Used in Generation of Return Visits Across Campus Ministries

The fourth dialogic principle is the conservation of visitors. As we will see, there are some similarities in the use of criteria for this principle across campus ministries.

Figure 13 shows that three of the campus ministries (Navigators, CCO and P2C-S) post to Facebook very regularly (99.4%-100%), but IVCF only sometimes posts regularly (60%). Another similarity is that these organizations either never (Navigators and IVCF) or rarely (CCO at 0.4% and P2C-S at 1.3%) solicit users to “like” their post. The third criteria here, including links to the organization’s other social media or website, had more variation with P2C-S doing this quite often (82.0%) and Navigators less frequently (17.6%).

Figure 13 Percentage of Criteria Used in Conservation of Visitors Across Campus Ministries

5.1.2 Results for Dialogic Interaction in Comments

Of the total posts analyzed in this 5-month time frame, the posts that included comments were analyzed further to explore the dialogic interaction or conversation taking place. To answer RQ1 further, not only are the posts and organization's responses examined, but also the user's engagement in the comment sections. Again, since there was variation among campus ministries for total number of posts, there was also a wide range of number of comments for each campus ministry (see Figure 14 below).

Therefore, it is noted the percent of posts that had comments, ranging from 10.3% with Navigators, and up to 50.0% with CCO. As an average, 28.7% of posts in this timeframe contained comments.

Figure 14 Percent of Comments Appearing in Total Number of Posts

Instead of including the appearance of these criteria as a fraction of all posts on the Page (total of 812 posts), only the posts that contained comments were included in this part of the analysis (total of 233 posts). Overall, the percent of comments that included ‘information exchange’ and ‘engaging conversation’ are seen in Figure 15. Generally, criteria for ‘engaging conversation’ occurred more often than ‘information exchange’, appearing in 75.5% of comments and 66.1% of comments respectively. Similar to the dialogic principles found in Facebook posts, these two forms of dialogic interactions are also not mutually exclusive, as criteria from both ‘information exchange’ and ‘engaging conversation’ could be seen in the same comment or comment section. All comments that were coded contained at least one criteria from ‘information exchange’ or one criteria from ‘engaging conversation’ (i.e., there were no comments that were coded “0” for both forms of dialogic interaction).

Figure 15 Percentage of Each Form of Dialogic Interaction Appearing in All Comments

The frequency of each criterion within each form of dialogic interaction is shown in Figure 16. The criteria occurring most often in comments was a user tagging another user (62.7%), followed by the user contributing something new (53.2%), and the user agreeing with or supporting the organization (30.9%). The criteria seen less are the user thanking the organization for the post (11.6%), the user asking a question or raising a concern about the post (10.7%) and lastly the user asking a specific question about the organization (0.9%).

Figure 16 Criteria for Dialogic Interaction Appearance as Percentage Within Total Comments

Since the posts were not mutually exclusive, more than one criterion could be present in the comments, and criteria from ‘information exchange’ and ‘engaging conversation’ could both be seen. Figure 17 demonstrates that there were some posts that did not contain any of the criteria identified for ‘information exchange’ (33.9% of comments) and ‘engaging conversation’ (24.5% of comments) independently. It was most likely for comments to contain one criteria for ‘information exchange’ (57.9%) or for ‘engaging conversation’ (57.5%). Fewer comments included two criteria from each form of dialogic interaction, seen in 8.2% of comments for ‘information exchange’, and 15.9% of comments for ‘engaging conversation’. Even less likely were comments that included all three criteria from each form of dialogic interaction, not seen at all with ‘information exchange’, and only seen in 2.1% of comments for ‘engaging conversation’.

Figure 17 Number of Criteria Appearing in Comment Sections of Posts with Comments

Within each form of dialogic interaction, we can also examine the make-up of the comments based on percentage of criteria seen within each form of dialogic interaction. Figure 18 makes it clear that most of the ‘information exchange’ involves users tagging other users (84.4% of comments using ‘information exchange’), while the ‘engaging

conversation’ is seen from a mix of users contributing something new (55.6% of comments), agreeing with the organization (32.3%), and thanking the organization (12.1%). Users would sometimes ask questions or raise concern about the post (14.5%) but infrequently asked questions about the organization as a whole (1.2%). This shows that there is more variety in the use of criteria for ‘engaging conversation’ compared to ‘information exchange’.

Figure 18 Criteria Appearing as Percentage Within Each Form of Dialogic Interaction

As well as examining the form of dialogic interaction present in comments throughout all of the campus ministries analyzed here, it is also important to note the differences between the campus ministries. Figure 19 demonstrates the ways dialogic interaction through ‘information exchange’ (and its specific criteria) were seen in the comment sections for each campus ministry. Generally, tagging another user was seen most frequently, in 80.4% of comments for P2C-S, 55.4% of comments for CCO, 42.9% of comments for IVCF and 17.6% of comments for Navigators. Happening less often was a user asking a question or raising concern about the post (between 10.3% and 11.8% for

three of the four campus ministries). Only IVCF received questions about the organization generally, seen in 28.6% of their comments. All four campus ministries had two different criteria for ‘information exchange’ present in their comments.

Figure 19 Percentage of Criteria Used in Information Exchange Across Campus Ministries

Figure 20 below demonstrates the varying ways dialogic interaction through ‘engaging conversation’ (and specific criteria) were seen in the comment sections for each campus ministry. As there was more variety in the appearance of these criteria across all campus ministries, there is also variety when comparing the presence of these criteria in each campus ministry. The criteria of the ‘user contributing something new’ was seen most often for three campus ministries (61.6% of comments for CCO, 58.8% of comments for Navigators, and 45.4% of comments for P2C-S) but the criteria of the ‘user thanking the organization’ was seen most often for the fourth campus ministry (42.9% for IVCF). The ‘user agreeing with or supporting the organization’ was seen most frequently with CCO in 45.5% of their comments, a criterion that was not seen at all in IVCF’s comments. This chart shows that there is more variety in the kinds of comments that demonstrate ‘engaging conversation’ compared to ‘information exchange’.

Figure 20 Percentage of Criteria Used in Engaging Conversation Across Campus Ministries

To review the campus ministry's use of each form of dialogic interaction, another comparison can be made. Although Figure 15 demonstrated the percentage of each form of dialogic interaction appearing in all comments that 'engaging conversation' was seen slightly more than 'information exchange', there is some variation when looking at the comments for each campus ministry. This general pattern is not consistent for all campus ministries. Figure 21 shows these differences. Generally, the Navigators and CCO follow the pattern of containing criteria for 'engaging conversation' more than 'information exchange', with the Navigators' comments including 23.5% for 'information exchange' and 88.2% for 'engaging conversation', and CCO's comments including 58.9% for 'information exchange' and 88.4% for engaging conversation. There is a difference with the range between the two forms of dialogic interaction: it is a much wider gap when considering the specific campus ministries rather than the average of all campus ministries (revisit Figure 15). P2C-S actually had the opposite trend, with more criteria from 'information exchange' appearing in their comments than criteria from 'engaging conversation' (82.5% and 59.8% respectively). Also interesting is that the comments for

IVCF include criteria from both ‘information exchange’ and ‘engaging conversation’ equally (57.1% for both).

Figure 21 Percentage of Each Form of Dialogic Interaction Appearing Across Campus Ministries

5.2 Discussion

5.2.1 Discussion for the Four Dialogic Principles

I conducted a content analysis of these four campus ministries’ Facebook Pages to determine if these non-profits use principles of dialogic communication that invite audience conversation (two-way) or use broadcast-style posts to promote the organization as a brand (one-way). There were several important findings and interesting insights that came out of the research. The main research question explored how the dialogic principles were used, and the study finds that campus ministries only make use of some dialogic principles in their posts and interactions with users online. This is similar to other research conducted on non-profit organization’s public relations practices on websites or social media (Kent & Taylor, 1998; Taylor, Kent & White, 2001; Kent, Taylor & White, 2003; Smith, 2007). There is, however, some difference in the frequency of use for each principle compared to previous research.

This study found that for these campus ministries, two dialogic principles were seen quite frequently (conservation of visitors in 99.3% of posts and usefulness of information in 90.3% of posts) but the other two dialogic principles were used less often (dialogic loop in 28.5% of posts and generation of return visits in 21.3% of posts). Previous research on platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and websites has found low use of all dialogic principles generally (Muckensturm, 2013). Other research discovered that the dialogic loop principle is generally low, usefulness of information is generally high, and the other two principles (generation of return visitors and conservation of visitors) are somewhere in between (Linville, McGee & Hicks, 2012; Luca, 2011). Other research that finds variation to this trend: in Muckensturm's (2013) analysis of the hotel's Facebook Pages there was low use of the generation of return visits (29.3%) compared to the other three principles and higher use of dialogic loop (67.4%). In this current study, the results seem to be different than previous research, which may be explained by the nature of the selected organizations (non-profit campus ministries) which made use of the principles in different ways.

Further insight on these findings can come from considering how these principles can be clustered, suggested by Taylor et al. (2001). The technical and design cluster includes usefulness of information and conservation of visitors, while the dialogic cluster includes dialogic loop and generation of return visits (Taylor et al., 2001). Ingenhoff & Koelling (2007) examined charitable non-profit organizations' website use according to these clusters and found a higher use of the technical and design cluster (mean of 47%) than the dialogic cluster (mean of 21%) (p. 68). The current study found a similar trend, that the technical and design cluster (mean of 94.8%) were used far more often than the

dialogic cluster (mean of 24.9%). Similar to what Ingenhoff & Koelling (2007) found, this data suggests that these organization's Facebook Pages meet some prerequisites of dialogue (it has useful information and provides reason for visitors to remain on the Page) but the relationship-building capacity was lacking (allowing visitor interaction and encouraging visitors to return).

There are some general trends noticed in the ways all four campus ministries used these dialogic principles to open up conversations with users, provide helpful information, encourage users to stay on the Page or return later, and ultimately build relationships. Overall, all four campus ministries follow the general pattern of two principles being present frequently (usefulness of information and conservation of visitors) and the other two principles less frequently (dialogic loop and generation of return visits) so some statements of generalization can be made.

With the dialogic loop principle, used in 28.5% of all posts, there would sometimes be effort made by the organization to create conversation by posing questions or soliciting feedback. Sometimes the question included in the post would be clearly answered in the comments, but other times no comments were left by users at all. Inviting audience conversation occurred in 14.8% of all posts, which help make users feel involved and able to participate. Responding to user comments, questions or complaints demonstrates good customer service by the organization. Responding to any of these comments left by users was seen in a total of 16.5% of posts. Compared to the percentage of posts that actually received comments (28.7%), generally these campus ministries responded to comments made on their posts 57.5% of the time. Any questions or complaints that came up tended to be practical or informational, centering around buying

tickets for an event or notifying the Page administrator that a posted video was not working. There were no questions or complaints about the position or claims made by an organization, in terms of theology or their mission and vision. In a couple cases, users asked about what the ministry does (ex. “Are you still allowed in the public high schools?”) but these were not accusatory or challenging in any sense. The dialogue resulting from these questions are more banal, rather than exceptional. The comments, questions and concerns were often responded to by the organization relatively promptly, although in some cases another user intervened and provided an answer or response.

The next principle, ‘usefulness of information’, was seen frequently in 90.3% of all posts. Generally, this principle was demonstrated through posting photos, videos or other multimedia as well as information on products, services or events. The photos or videos provided by these campus ministries demonstrates what the organization has to offer: it could be photos of students involved on a specific campus, at a retreat during the school year, at an annual conference, or on a mission trip. All of these help tell a story to users and invite them to become part of what is happening (if they have not been already). Criteria seen slightly less here were links to outside sources (which were often articles or blog posts) and information on the company (historical information, or details on the national ministry). The posts did not provide contact information frequently, which may be because this information can be found on other areas of the Facebook Page, or the Facebook Page itself can act as a method of communication for users to contact the organization (i.e., they could send a message or leave a comment/question right on the Page and expect a response).

The generation of return visits principle was seen the least often, in 21.3% of

posts. This principle was heavily made up of asking users to register (for a conference), donate (to the organization, a specific mission trip, or a missionary/staff member) or apply (to go on a mission trip or become a staff member). All of these “asks” consisted of 75.2% of posts using this principle. This is understandable, as a non-profit organization would be seeking donations as one of their purposes of communicating with audiences. It was interesting to see many of the campus ministries post invitations to donate on “Giving Tuesday” (which follows Black Friday and Cyber Monday) with details on specific staff members or mission trips. This principle was not used as frequently as other principles because the other criteria appeared much less often: contests designed to draw people back to see the results were only seen with one campus ministry, and promotions or discounts were not used by all campus ministries and usually only offered for specific events (tickets for conference). Some campus ministries had discounts available on Black Friday and one on Boxing Day, but these are isolated days so this criterion was understandably not used very often throughout the sample period. As well, asking users to “share” the post was seldom observed, but that did not prevent users from sharing the post as some chose to do anyway (i.e., users do not need to be told to share a post if the content is good enough for them to share).

The dialogic principle appearing the most often was the conservation of visitors, which appeared in 99.3% of posts. This was largely due to the criteria “posting regularly” which made up two thirds (62.8%) of the posts applying this principle. Three of the campus ministries consistently posted regularly (more than 3 times a week) and only one campus ministry was less consistent in this amount of regular posting. Organizations would link to their own websites because of the limits of Facebook. For example, this

social media site does not have the capacity to do event registration (for conferences) so a link must be provided to the organization's website where that can be done. In linking to these other websites or the organization's other social pages might lead a viewer off of the organization's official Facebook Page but it still keeps them from going to content and information provided by a source other than the organization. The criteria seen infrequently here involved asking users to "like" a post. Similar to asking users to "share" a post, these campus ministries try posting things that viewers will like without being told to do that action directly.

In analyzing the posts on the four different campus ministries, the study also expected to find some variation across campus ministries. This research reveals a connection between the number of followers a campus ministry has on Facebook (measured in Page likes), and the use of dialogic principles. However, it is not possible to make direct claims for causation (whether larger following size directly results in higher use of dialogic principles), as this finding was not a main concern for this research. There are, still, some noteworthy observations here. CCO, the campus ministry with the most Page likes (n=19,624) generally used certain criteria for dialogic principles the most compared to other campus ministries. P2C-S also made use of a variety of dialogic criteria and has the second highest number of Page likes (n=4,273). IVCF and Navigators (which had 1,864 and 574 Page likes respectively) were more likely to have 0 criteria used within each dialogic principle, so their smaller following size seems related to the absence of certain criteria. Other variations between posts for each campus ministry are found in the content of their posts.

The Navigators is the organization with the least number of Page likes (n=574) out of all campus ministries examined here. It sometimes had criteria or principles present in different proportions than the other campus ministries. The Navigators generally used ‘generation of return visits’ less frequently than the other three organizations (10.3% of their posts). They also used the principle ‘usefulness of information’ differently as they included more links to outside sources than the other organizations (often to articles or blog posts by sites like Relevant Magazine or Desiring God), and had less information on their products or events (which was likely because they did not have any major events or conferences, and did not provide details on local ministries or mission trip details). The majority of posts by The Navigators were articles that would be of interest to audiences that like the Page, but they are not necessarily specific to what The Navigators do. There is more sharing of outside content rather than creating their own content for this group.

IVCF has more Page likes than the Navigators, but has the least number of posts in the timeframe considered for this project (making up only 45 posts of the total 812 analyzed). Generally, IVCF used the dialogic loop principle less than the other three (6.7% of their posts) and the criteria most frequently present for this principle is also different. IVCF invites comments from the audience less often, and responds to or “likes” comments less frequently than the other campus ministries, but responds to more questions posed by users as a proportion of all comments/questions. IVCF also posts less regularly than the others (only 60% of posts were considered regular posts) and it links to other IVCF social media sites or affiliated websites often (71.1% of posts).

CCO is the campus ministry with the most Page likes compared to the other three groups (n=19,724). This campus ministry generally uses many of the criteria for the four dialogic principles the most frequently, having the highest percentage of posts for dialogic loop (33.9%) and generation of return visits (29.9%), and tied for the highest percentage for conservation of visitors (P2C-S also had it present in 100% of posts). Other criteria that CCO used most out of all four campus ministries were: responding to or “liking” a comment (20.1%), using photos, videos or other multimedia (88.8%), giving information on products or events (81.7%), inviting the audience to register, apply or donate (29.0%), and posting regularly (100%). In all four dialogic principles, the posts by CCO contained the top appearing criteria the most (aside from P2C-S also posting regularly). This could be related to the amount of Page likes that CCO has, since there are more viewers and fans of CCO with whom the organization should engage. Making use of more principles of dialogic communication can assist in making connections between users and CCO, encouraging them to return to the Page and engage with their posts.

P2C-S does not have the most Page likes but it did have the most posts for the time frame considered in this study (378 posts of the total 812 analyzed, or 47% of the entire sample). Although CCO often used the dialogic principles (and certain criteria) the most compared to the other campus ministries, P2C-S was close behind. P2C-S uses some criteria the most: contests (1.3%) links to the organization’s other social media or website (82.0%), asking the user to “like” the post (1.3%), and tied with CCO for posting regularly (100%). In other cases, P2C-S uses certain criteria the second most often: responding to or “liking” a comment (16.1%), providing information on products or events (70.9%), and asking the user to “share” the post (1.9%). P2C-S was the only

campus ministry that held contests, although how they appeared in the posts were in Facebook Live videos at a conference that mentioned the contest happening in-person, and later announcing the winner. They were also one of the only organizations that directly asked users to “like” a post, to show solidarity in demonstrating who was joining or doing something that P2C-S was planning (a day of prayer). P2C-S provided links to their other social media pages or their own website quite often, as many of their posts pointed to conference registration, mission trip applications, or blog posts published on the P2C-S website.

Overall, Canadian campus ministries do employ some principles of dialogic communication, but do so to varying degrees. Similar to other research on dialogic communication and social media, it can be claimed that these organizations are not using the platform to its full potential to engage with supporters and site users, although some prerequisites for dialogue are seen in their posts. In previous research, this “potential” of social media for dialogic communication seems to be found in the platform itself, and it is the responsibility of the Page administrator to take advantage of the benefits of the social media platform to engage with their audiences. In this project, I additionally note how there are limits in the structure and design of Facebook itself, and that perhaps dissemination can be valuable for an organization’s communication online.

5.2.2 Discussion for the Dialogic Interaction in Comments

This study also examined user comments and the types of dialogic interaction taking place on the Facebook Pages of these campus ministries. In exploring what constitutes dialogue, the analysis sought to explore the nature of the conversation taking place online: whether it is shallow, instrumental, and information-focused, or deeper,

meaningful, and emphasizes relationship-building with audiences. It is important to include analysis like this, beyond noting if there was simply a response or “like” on a comment, question or complaint (found in the dialogic loop principle). This project expected to find dialogue taking place through both forms of interaction in a combination of comments categorized as ‘information exchange’ as well as ‘engaging conversation’. As well, it predicted there to be some posts with no comments at all, and of the posts that did have comments the criteria for ‘engaging conversation’ would not always be present.

There was variation across the campus ministries in the percentage of posts that received comments. On average (for all organizations), 28.7% of posts received comments. CCO has the most comments on their posts (50%), followed by P2C-S (25.7%), IVCF (15.6%), and lastly the Navigators (10.3%).

The data show that there was indeed a combination of comments in both of these categories, but slightly more from ‘engaging conversation’ (in 75.5% of comments) than ‘information exchange’ (in 66.1% of comments) when looking at all of the campus ministries together. The criteria that occurred most often (generally) was ‘tagging another user’, a criterion of ‘information exchange’, which was identified in 62.7% of all comments. The other two criteria for this form of dialogic interaction occurred much less often (asking a question about the post or the organization) so there is less variety in what ‘information exchange’ looked like in comments. The criteria occurring second most often was the user contributing something new (30.9%), which is found in ‘engaging conversation’. The other two criteria for this form of dialogic interaction occurred slightly more often than the criteria for ‘information exchange’ (user agreeing with or supporting the organization seen in 30.9% of comments and the user thanking the

organization in 11.6% of comments). Although the most frequently occurring criteria is found in ‘information exchange’, there is more variation and general appearance of the criteria for ‘engaging conversation’.

The data presented here also shows that there was considerable variation in the amount of criteria present for the two forms of dialogic interaction, and these varied depending on the nature of the campus ministry. The Navigators had far more comments that used ‘engaging conversation’ (88.2%) than ‘information exchange’ (23.5%). This campus ministry had ‘information exchange’ present the least compared to the other campus ministries. CCO had the same general pattern that matched the average of all campus ministries, with ‘engaging conversation’ (88.4%) seen in more comments than ‘information exchange’ (58.9%). Within ‘information exchange’, CCO was the group that had two of the criteria present in their comments the most (contributing something new and agreeing with the organization). P2C-S followed an opposite pattern, though, as there were more comments that used ‘information exchange’ (82.5%) than ‘engaging conversation’ (59.8%). For P2C-S, they had the criteria seen most often for ‘information exchange’ compared to the other campus ministries (tagging another user seen in 80.4% of comments). The fourth group, IVCF, had an even split with each occurring in 57.1% of comments. This was the only group that received questions about the organization, and the criteria ‘thanking an organization’ was seen in the highest percentage of comments for IVCF (42.9%). It was interesting to map such variation in the proportions of the two forms of dialogic communication in the comments for each organization. There was not one unified pattern that was identified across all four organizations, as only two demonstrated ‘engaging conversation’ more than ‘information exchange’.

In light of these findings, a question arises: if dialogue is considered the most meaningful form of communication in public relations, can “genuine dialogue” in the manner described by Martin Buber as an authentic exchange focused on forging connection and empathy, take place online? There are some connections and discussion happening on these Facebook posts, but how deep is the level of engagement? Such interactions may be the most measurable form of communication (through number of likes, comments, shares), but it is not necessarily the most meaningful. Some community building and relationship development may be happening in the comments for the organizations considered here. However, these developments also operate alongside offline communities and relationships, so these online relationships and engagements are not the only form of interaction to consider. On social media, “followers tend to be people who are already associated and/or interested in the agency” (Olsson & Eriksson, 2016, p. 194). People will likely become involved with the campus ministry in-person as well as online, so some of the online audiences could be people who are connected with the ministry on their campus already and visit the Page to continue staying connected. So, non-profit organizations can build and maintain relationships with their key audiences and stakeholders in different ways, both online and offline. This should be remembered, as the online communication and interactions are likely not the only way individuals connect with the organization.

5.2.3 Facebook, Dialogue and Promotional Culture

Considering the way that these campus ministries post and interact with their followers on Facebook, it appears that they are caught in some of the trappings of promotional culture. Seen in their Facebook posts, these non-profits will sometimes

behave like a for-profit by: holding contests and promotions, prompting users to “like” a post, providing content that appeals to their main target audience (post-secondary students), and potentially utilizing data on user’s behavior and preferences to target ads at the right people. While the campus ministries do make use of some principles of dialogic communication, there are a few questions that come out of this analysis: Is dialogue the most desirable form of communication? Are users reinforcing the image and ‘brand’ of the organization by interacting with it online? Are these public relations best practices applicable for non-profit groups, or are they most suitable in the for-profit sector?

When analyzing the comments, it was interesting to see that there is some dialogical labour being done for the organization’s benefit that are not done by the organization itself. There were times when a user would respond to questions on the post before the Page administrator would, or comments included thanks for people in the post rather than the organization as a whole. Some users knew different staff members (including who manages the Facebook Page, staff on their campus, the founders or the national director) so they would interact with those people on the Facebook Page too. In these ways, many people contribute to the image and online presence of the organization: it is not just staff from the communications or marketing department, but also other staff members, students, and everyday users who are, in a way, acting as promotional intermediaries by contributing their time and efforts to assist the organization’s online communications. Olsson & Eriksson (2016) note this trend, that “organizational image- and reputation-building is no longer solely in the hands of management” but concerns staff, organization members, and other stakeholders that use social media (p. 191).

Even audiences are realizing the promotional nature of these non-profits, especially when they recognize themselves in the organization's ads or posts. These campus ministries generally use their own photos of students involved in the ministry, rather than stock photos. Sometimes users will point out to others that they are in the photo or video and may say they are "famous". Some students are happy to get this recognition, while others are less enthusiastic after recognizing themselves in the ministry's promotional materials. One user involved with CCO commented, "My face is on this poster twice, can I get free admission to the conference?" and again in another post wrote, "my face is literally alllll over their ads for this year! I'm still waiting for my free registration." In this way, there are times when users and students involved in the organization become unwilling (and unpaid) promotional intermediaries. This lash back, whether serious or lighthearted, could be explained by the personal nature of the user's image being used by the organization, similar to Brown's (2013) findings on Flickr users and the intimately personal connection to their artefacts (uploaded photos) that can become exploited online.

As well, there are tensions between best practices for dialogic engagement and promotional culture. There were some measures or criteria used in this analysis (and in previous research on dialogic communication online) that, while dialogical, are also promotional in nature. Asking a user to "like" or "share" a post, running contests, and offering promotions or discounts all contribute to the objective of keeping visitors on the Page and increasing user participation. Such actions are valued by Facebook as a company, who design the platform to encourage users to continue using the site and make it advertiser-friendly (Freakonomics Radio, 2016). This is another way that non-profits

are trapped: these organizations are attempting to reach their current and potentially interested audiences through a platform that is considered ideal for dialogic, two-way interactions, yet are left with an imperfect mode of engagement. Facebook as a company can extract value from the organizations' use of the platform and users' engagement with their posts. These types of promotionally oriented posts may be used by the organization to strengthen its image and brand, while also attempting to facilitate dialogue and interaction. Facebook as a company may be the one who benefits the most, though.

The dominance of promotional culture has influenced non-profit organizations. They "have undergone a market turn inspired by the private sector, which has resulted in visibility and branding being prioritized, instead of ideals related to democracy and transparency" (Olsson & Eriksson, 2016, p. 189). This market logic from the commercial sector has infiltrated the non-profit sector, bringing with it the "business bias" of marketing and public relations best practices (Andreason, 2012).

Previous research on dialogic communication online has found organizations are "not yet fully engaging their publics in two-way communication" (Taylor, Kent & White, 2001), and "not using the sites to their full potential" (Waters et al., 2009). One way to explain why these campus ministries only use some principles of dialogic communication relates to the design of Facebook itself that places restrictions on potential user engagement. For example, the user experience on this social networking site is largely determined by its technological infrastructure. Since Facebook's algorithm decides which posts are displayed or hidden in a user's News Feed (Tufekci, 2016), certain posts may not be seen by a user if their previous online activity suggests they are not interested. This limits how everyday users are exposed to and able to interact with posts made by

organizations on Facebook. There may be less response on an organization's Facebook Page based on how visible its posts are, leaving the organization unable to respond to user comments or engage in meaningful conversation.

Non-profits in particular may be at a disadvantage because of changes to Facebook's algorithm and the option for companies to "pay-to-play" to promote their own postings (Traven, 2014). Groups who are unable to do this "will be more hidden from public view, or will experience changes to their reach that are beyond their ability to control" (Tufekci, 2014, p. 26). Related to user engagement and dialogue, Taylor & Kent (2014) emphasize: "in dialogic engagement, the public has an equally important role to play" (p. 394). It is not just the organization that has to be open to having the interaction, but the audience or user must also be responding and engaging in the conversation too. The user's response can be limited at times because of Facebook's underlying design and advertising-driven business model.

Additionally, Page administrators may not use the different features on Facebook that can initiate and continue dialogic conversation (i.e., responding to or "liking" every comment, question, or concern given; using the private message feature). They may treat a social media channel similar to the previous communication channels that the organization used, whether online or not, that are unidirectional and static, such as newsletters, websites, or press releases. Other research on social media use for public agencies found that "even though social media was developed with the idea of dialogue in mind, it is most often used by communication professionals as a way of disseminating one-way information" (Olsson & Eriksson, 2016, p. 190). Maintaining relationships with key audiences online takes significant time and effort put in by the Page administrator

(who may be a volunteer or a staff member), so this may also give reason to why some of these principles were not used as highly. If so many companies and organizations are using social media as a one-way tool to communicate with their audiences, this may be reflective of one main way these online platforms should be used. Perhaps dissemination does have a place in Internet communication and can be valued for what it does enable.

In this section, the results from the content analysis confirm previous research on dialogic communication online that organizations do not use the platform to its full potential, according to the value of dialogue in public relations and online communication. To answer the question “What style(s) of communication do campus ministries use on their Facebook Pages: one-way/instrumental or two-way/ dialogic?” we can look to three elements that suggest if dialogue was seen. Based on the use of dialogic principles, there was some dialogue taking place between organization and audience (site visitors), as all four dialogic principles were utilized, although to varying degrees. Second, considering the conversations on these posts, there was some dialogue occurring with just over a quarter of all posts containing comments (28.7%). There were more posts with “likes” that did not contain comments, but liking a post is considered the minimum display of interaction or engagement. Third, when examining the content of the comments, there was some variety in the nature of the dialogue taking place, as both elements of simple information exchange and meaningful engagement were seen.

Do these organizations also use one-way addresses on their Facebook Pages? Are they always instrumental in nature, serving to build and promote their brand? Or is this dissemination actually valuable for online communication as well? All of the posts and the general use of Facebook Pages to share information about the organization and its

offerings can be considered a form of dissemination in the way that Peters (1999, 2006) suggests. The content provided on these Pages are broadcast to geographically dispersed users who receive the message (i.e., see the post in their Facebook News Feed) at different times, responding in whatever way they decide. These potential receivers could be people who already like the Page, are recommended to like the Page, or who see sponsored ads as they use the site. They choose how to respond, by ignoring, engaging minimally by “liking” the post, or providing further thought or effort by commenting, sharing, or tagging another user. Dissemination is also a valuable form of communication that can be used on social media, and it is a useful way of looking at online communication.

For religious or Christian groups, dissemination can be used as a way to share the message of the Gospel with more people. It is valued in evangelism, by putting the message out there, making it available for all people to hear and personally choose how to respond. Romans 10:14 addresses how the “message of salvation to all” must be brought to others by being shared widely: “How then will they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in him or whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without someone preaching?” (English Standard Version). The role of the Christian is to share this message with others so that more may hear and believe in Jesus. The campus ministries considered in this research can consider how dissemination can also be valuable for spreading the Gospel, and furthering their other organizational goals, through their online communications.

6 Chapter: Conclusions

6.1 Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations for this study. First, there are limits with studying social media that should be stated. Simply because of its newness and how it can change quickly in a short period of time, research on social media can become dated within a few years. As well, there are not as many established methods or theories for researching social media. Although there were some studies that applied the dialogic principles to look at social media, it is not yet refined, especially for non-profit organizations. For instance, my study also explored the dialogic interactions taking place in the comments, which has not yet been done with the measures I used. I also noted that some criteria for the dialogic principles appear more oriented towards promotion than oriented to dialogue, and that their use may be benefitting Facebook more than the organization itself.

Another limitation relates to the sample of posts analyzed from each campus ministry, some comparisons were difficult to make, as one campus ministry had fewer than 50 posts in the five months considered, while another had almost 400. It was harder to make generalizations and compare number or frequency of posts when each campus ministry had a different number of total posts. Percentages were used to make fairer comparisons, by claiming an organization had a certain percentage of posts that included a certain criterion, rather than comparing absolute number of posts they appeared in.

A similar limitation related to coding and the chosen methodology is that inter-coder reliability was not used in this study because of resource constraints. Nevertheless, because of the rigor used to provide clear guidelines for what posts were included in each criteria being analyzed, the coding results can still be seen as valid.

As this study only considered four campus ministries, it should also be noted that the results cannot be generalized to all Christian campus groups across Canada. Other types of ministries (whether special interest campus ministries, church-sponsored groups on campus, or region-specific groups), or other faith-based campus organizations (i.e., those serving Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, or other religious groups) may use their social media in similar ways, or they could engage with their audiences in a distinct way, using different principles of dialogic communication in their posts.

In selecting to analyze the national social media presence of the organizations on Facebook, there may also be a limit in the data collected on how the organization and its online identity are understood. The image and mode of engaging with users online may vary significantly between the official national Facebook Page and local campus ministry Facebook Pages or groups. As well, this study does not take into account the uses of Facebook for interactions other than those that occur publicly on the organization's Page. There are also private messages, Facebook groups, and Facebook events where more in-depth and symmetrical conversations can take place in smaller groups or one-on-one.

As well, this study was focused on the use of organizations' Facebook Pages and did not consider other forms of organizational communication, such as other social media platforms, newsletters, earned media coverage, or annual reports that might be published directly to its website.

There are a complex number of different stakeholders who may be the audience of any single organization's social media. In addition to students who follow a campus ministry's Facebook Page, there are also donors, staff members, and others who are interested in or supportive of the ministry's purpose and activities. So, researchers cannot

assume that campus ministries have a single audience with which they are trying to engage online (students). This may be one of their key audiences for the activities of these campus ministries in-person, but the make-up of their entire audience is more complicated than this. This can be seen in looking at the demographics of Page followers which can be accessed through Facebook Page insights available to Page administrators, but which was not available for this study.

Noting the material nature of a social media site like Facebook also presented some limitations generally and in terms of potential user interaction. This is seen with how algorithms and data-mining will inform what information, posts, and suggested Pages are shown to a user. This limits what users are able to see and engage with on their Facebook Pages, through technical structures that remain hidden to the everyday user. They may be encouraged to engage with certain content without realizing why or understanding the power relations existing underneath (the ownership of the platform, the monetization of user data, the selling of ad space, etc.).

A final limitation with this research is the difficulty in analyzing dialogic communication. It is challenging to gauge the degree of depth in conversation or strength of relationship based on a surface level assessment of comments and replies online. Thus, it is not possible to be fully confident in concluding that conversations taking place online are truly engaging or contributing to relationship building. As well, there may be efforts by the organization to initiate or spur on dialogue and interaction through the content of their posts, but the audience may not engage back. So it is not that there is no effort by these groups, because having dialogic communication depends equally on the audience members speaking back to the organization. Perhaps a viewer or audience member only

has time to “like” a post when they first come across it and may not feel like putting in time to write out an answer or response at that time. Some of these challenges make it difficult for dialogic communication to be evident and also measured.

6.2 Recommendations for Future Research

Considering the scope, direction and limitations of this research project, there are a handful of opportunities for future research to build upon this study.

To start, the selected sample could be altered for a more in-depth study of one campus or city, and the local chapters of the campus ministries present there. This could explore how local campus ministries use Facebook groups, if it is a staff member or a student managing the Page, and if they are given branding guidelines or directions to match the organization’s official national Page.

Alternatively, there could be comparison made across the different kinds of campus ministries (whether based on religious affiliation, special interest, or location) or focus on distinctions based on size of ministry (number of students involved) or size of online following (number of Page likes).

It may also be useful to examine the complete online presence of non-profit organizations like this. Research could explore what channels they are using, which ones are updated and used most often, and which invite dialogic communication the most. Considering all of the available online channels to reach an audience would be helpful for marketing or communications managers of organizations like this, to make note of industry trends and any new channels that non-profits should attempt to move into.

Another suggestion would be to use mixed methodology to analyze social media use for campus ministries. This type of research would gather insight from all those

involved with the dialogic interactions and managing the online communications.

Interviews could be conducted for the Facebook Page managers and the leaders of the communications or marketing team. Information gathered here could include how they approach posting on social media, long-term vs. short-term planning, if relationship building is important to the communications team, education level of the Page administrator(s), and how “success” is understood. Some may see success through measures provided by Facebook (likes, post views, reach) while others may also consider the follow-through (becoming motivated by social media to register for an event, donate, or become active in the organization somehow).

Lastly, since research on social media is considered so new, this field of research will likely continue to expand and broaden. Models and measures for the five principles of dialogic communication for non-profits should be further developed and amended to take into consideration the complexity of their audience, and their lack of orientation towards a profit. McAllister-Spooner (2009) suggests the measurement of the dialogic principles should be refined and standardized (for example, adding different weights in calculating the principles). Similarly, the design for analyzing comments for dialogic interaction could be further modified and developed in order to explore the nature of dialogic conversations taking place online. There may be other measuring tools that are more useful for analyzing social media which should be utilized in research on non-profit organizations. Future research in this area will hopefully continue to reveal tensions between online marketing (branding, promotions, advertising) and non-profits.

6.3 Conclusions

This thesis examines how four Canadian campus ministries (Power to Change – Students, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, The Navigators, and Catholic Christian Outreach) use Facebook for promotional and dialogical purposes. This thesis was guided by a central question: What style(s) of communication do campus ministries use on their Facebook Pages: one-way (instrumental) or two-way (dialogic)? To answer this, I conducted a content analysis of the non-profits' Facebook Pages (their posts and comment sections) to explore if they use principles of dialogic communication that encourage audience conversation (two-way) or use broadcast-style posts to promote the organization as a brand (one-way). It found that campus ministries make use of some dialogic principles in their posts and interactions with users online through their Facebook Pages, but at times use dissemination to share information as well.

There were a few important findings related to the use of dialogic principles in Facebook posts. With this project, two dialogic principles (conservation of visitors and usefulness of information) were used frequently across all campus ministries, and two dialogic principles were used less often (dialogic loop and generation of return visits). Since the technical and design cluster were used more often than the dialogic cluster, this suggests that these organization's Facebook Pages meet some prerequisites of dialogue but the relationship-building capacity was not as highly prioritized. This study demonstrated that all posts included at least one principle of dialogic communication, so the organizations do use different strategies to encourage two-way interaction and build relationships with their key audiences.

This thesis was also concerned with the interactions taking place in the comments of these posts. The study questioned “what constitutes dialogue?” whether it is simply having an interaction (or providing the possibility for an interaction to take place) or if the content is also significant to be considered true dialogic communication. Is basic information exchange enough, or should it be a deeper, more meaningful type of engagement to truly build relationship? It appeared that both types of interaction took place on these platforms, although criteria for ‘engaging conversation’ showed more robust and fruitful elements of conversation than ‘information exchange’. There were some posts with no comments at all, with an average (for all organizations) of 28.7% of posts receiving comments.

This thesis also begins to ask other questions related to dialogue: Is dialogue inherently “better” than dissemination? Could organizations use both dialogic and disseminative strategies simultaneously for different purposes? John Durham Peters began this discussion on dissemination vs. dialogue, noting how dialogue has been highly regarded. Within public relations best practices, dialogic communication is similarly valued for building relationships.

There are definite benefits to both modes of communication, and each one is suitable for different contexts. Although dialogue is valuable, dissemination is also necessary at times to share information with larger, more dispersed audiences. When considering how these campus ministries use digital media for engagement, a mix of these methods could be used depending on the nature of the content being shared. Dissemination would be well-suited for evangelism and mission mobilization (spreading the Gospel locally and globally by simply getting the message out), while dialogue would

be useful for disciple-making (building more intentional, long-term relationships with other Christians). These activities typically take place in person, but could be further supported by online strategies. Dissemination is seen in the Christian tradition as the most loving, just, and democratic (Peters, 1999). However, the logic of the market (which privileges dialogue and measuring impressions) is often inherently at odds with the logic of evangelism (which is slower, less measurable work, done through dissemination).

As well, in many cases, dialogue may not be possible online in the same way as in person. Just as engaging in religious virtual communities and communicating with friends online can be seen as concessions to in-person communities and conversations, we can similarly view organizational communication as a supplement to the activities and relationship-building being done in person. In fact, many of the activities of these campus ministries are more suited to occur in person, and there is a degree of authenticity and immediacy required to do them best. This is seen in the three main activities of campus ministries: evangelism (sharing the Gospel and leading people to Christ is best done in-person and over time), making disciples (building people up in Christ happens through developing relationships with other Christians), and mission mobilization (people are physically being sent to the nations to share the Gospel with other people). The majority of these activities involve human interactions, people growing in relationship with one another and with Christ. One potential reason why the real, in-person, lived community is so valued for these religious activities may derive from the importance of voice in the Christian tradition (for example, the congregation reading scripture out loud or singing hymns as an act of worship) and meeting together or fellowshiping with the church

body. Communication through social media can be seen as playing a supporting role to help further the ministry's goals and vision.

After considering these findings and the various complexities and nuances of non-profit marketing on social media, there are several important contributions that should be noted. This research contributes to the bodies of literature that the project draws upon: promotional communication, marketing, public relations, and religion and media. In exploring the communicative conditions in which campus ministries operate and how they use social media to advance their evangelical missions, it contributes to critical perspectives of non-profit marketing and public relations. It argues that promotional culture is a dominant force whose market logic has extended into not only commercial spheres but the non-profit sector as well. By occupying a more critical position to explore social media, I question the deeper effects of online marketing practices, the limitations of non-profits using of business-oriented models in their communications, and how the power relations behind Facebook influence the social media channel's potential. As research on dialogic communication on social media continues to expand, this study adds to the variety of non-profit organizations analyzed: in this case, faith-based on-campus clubs in Canada. The current study also provides another example of a religious organization using media and advertising for evangelistic or missional purposes.

This research provides a few practical applications and suggestions for non-profit organizations and their communications teams. Those working for non-profit organizations like campus ministries should be aware of the limits and benefits to each form of communication (dialogue and dissemination) and recognize where each can best be used. The dialogic principles suggested to use for organizations seeking to build

relationships with interested publics should be considered just that: principles. They are not absolutely necessary elements of a communication plan, but guidelines that can help facilitate positive relationships between publics and the organization. If they are used well, and in ways that are suitable to the non-profit organization's mission and goals, they could help facilitate dialogue and build trust with key audiences. When an organization is presented as a trustworthy one that cares about its audience and wants to develop long-term relationships, those relationships will form much easier.

The role of the communications manager is quite complex today, as Flynn (2014) notes: "No longer are communicators simply creating messages and projecting them into a controlled communications arena. Today's successful and effective public relations practitioners are actively listening, engaging, and building and cultivating relationships on- and off-line, in real time and around the world" (p. 381). With such pressure in the external media environment, those behind the online presence of these organizations should be aware of the language used in their posts, and whether the organization will appear to invite conversation and build relationship, or look like another company seeking to put out a better branded image of themselves.

It is also important for these staff to understand how social media works (how algorithms may control the content that users will encounter on Facebook), and the type of media environment that users are operating in (which is saturated in ads and abundant in information). Organizations should also remember that engagement online is not always reflective of engagement offline, and that these users are real people who have personal experiences and connections with the organization. Those relationships exist in-

person, whether or not they demonstrate their support and connection by liking and commenting on the non-profit's Facebook posts.

Campus ministries should look deeper into their own traditions for alternate media strategies (i.e., Jesus' disseminative approach) in order to break free from the market logic. Jesus modeled how to spread his message to his disciples first, then to the crowds, and later to the world. If the main goals of campus ministries are to build disciples and evangelize, then communications plans should follow using dialogic or disseminative strategies in suitable ways. Campus ministries could also consider thinking differently about metrics and success, recognizing that broadcasting a message that does not receive a response can still be a useful form of sharing the Christian message. They could choose to use online platforms like Facebook for particular purposes (scheduling events, sharing information, etc.) and be less fixated on building a 'brand' if it is not the best way to use the specific platform.

The findings of this study are useful for other non-profit organizations and can inform future research on this topic. In exploring how these organizations use social media, I hope to open up a discussion around the tensions in non-profit communication and public relations. At times, these non-profits appeared to be promotionally oriented and they even used visitors as promotional intermediaries, whether they appear in the ministry's promotional material or they tag other users to further the post's reach. After conducting this research, I suggest that non-profits should use public relations best practices that are different from for-profit organizations so they do not appear too branded and self-promotional, ones that consider the unique characteristics of non-profits.

In many ways, non-profit organizations still behave like those organizations whose primary mandate is to earn profit. Both are caught in the trappings of promotional culture and must operate within the same pressures and constraints. The current media-saturated world we live in is dominated by the imperative to brand and promote, a force which has captured not only commercial brands, but non-profit organizations too. Non-profits will borrow both marketing tactics and public relations best practices from for-profit organizations, even if the models are not adapted well to their unique activities and supporters. Campus ministries should be aware of the challenges and tensions found in promotional culture, marketing and public relations in the contemporary media environment. There are already plenty of promotional messages found in our daily media consumption, and non-profit organizations should stand out as offering something distinctly different from commercial organizations, inviting people to join their mission of changing the world in some way. In the case of these campus ministries, they seek to change the world through students and the message of Jesus. Their staff can be good stewards of the online technology they use to share the Gospel with more people and further the ministry's mission and vision, through dialogue and/or dissemination.

Appendices

Appendix A Criteria for Dialogic Principles

A.1 Examples of Criteria for the Dialogic Loop Principle

Providing opportunity for the audience to respond (ex. posing a question, inviting comments from the audience)	Power to Change - Students September 20, 2016 · 🌐 Have you been a part of reaching East Asia these last twenty years? Leave us a comment and share a story. Sharing is caring... and it can inspire more students to participate in #P2CGlobalMissions
Responding to a user's question (ex. about technology not working, an event coming up, a promotion/discount code, the organization more generally, etc.)	Sam · 17:26 Is session 2 posted? Like · Reply · 1 · December 29, 2016 at 4:06pm Catholic Christian Outreach · 22:20 Sam Hey Sam, it was recorded live, but not yet posted, we'll let you know when it's published. Like · Reply · 3 · December 29, 2016 at 4:12pm
Responding to a user's complaint/concern (ex. related to the content of article, something is inaccurate, something is not working/there is a technology failure)	FREE DOWNLOAD from Being There: How to Love Those Who Are Hurting Ever wondered how to truly love those who are hurting? Then get this free download from Being There: How to Love Those Who Are Hurting. VERGENETWORK.ORG Like · Comment · Share Top Comments Write a comment... Joseph the book isn't free. a Chapter is, but you still have to buy the entire book if you want to read the rest of it. 😞 Like · Reply · November 1, 2016 at 10:17pm · Edited The Navigators of Canada Sorry about that Joseph. Hopefully there's still some good stuff in that chapter Like · Reply · November 1, 2016 at 10:19pm Joseph The Navigators of Canada Well, it is the first chapter. so at least it doesn't drop you in somewhere and risk some loss of context.
Responding to or "liking" a user's comment	The Navigators of Canada likes this. he ultimate disciple-maker. He is our first Like · Reply · 1 · December 27, 2016 at 10:09am The Navigators of Canada Yes indeed Ray. It can be easy to get caught up in the latest trends, but it's always worth going back to the source Like · Reply · 1 · December 27, 2016 at 10:12am

A.2 Examples of Criteria for Usefulness of Information Principle

<p>Links to outside sources (other sites, blogs, articles, Facebook Pages) that are <i>not</i> the campus ministry's</p>	<div data-bbox="841 275 1412 863"> <p>The Navigators of Canada August 19, 2016 · 🌐</p><p>In the plethora of online social spheres we regularly plug into, how can we be more like Jesus to those we interact with?</p><p>To get you started, here are eight ideas, courtesy of RELEVANT Magazine. What others do you think should be added to this list? Let us know in the comments below.</p> <p>8 Things Christians Need to Do More on Social Media The internet doesn't have to be a terrible place. RELEVANTMAGAZINE.COM</p></div>
<p>Photos, videos and other multimedia (ex. podcasts, GIFs)</p>	<div data-bbox="841 909 1412 1560"> <p>Catholic Christian Outreach added 679 new photos from December 2016 to the album: RISE UP Vancouver 2016 — with Eric Filion and 10 others at The Westin Bayshore. December 2016 · 📷 · 🌐</p><p>Rise Up is a conference for young adults hosted by Catholic Christian Outreach, a Canadian university student movement – but Rise Up is more than a conference. It exists to motivate and inspire leaders for the renewal of the world.</p></div>

<p>Providing company information (ex. historical/archival information, details of the national ministry, something visionary)</p>	<div data-bbox="857 195 1425 966"> <div> <div> Power to Change - Students October 6, 2016 · 🌐 </div> </div> <p>#TBT - This year marks the 20th anniversary of our partnership in East Asia. Over time, we have seen hundreds of young Canadians bringing the light of the gospel to this region. We have seen God working in incredible ways -- seeing East Asian students come to faith, growing the underground church, and raising up East Asian missionaries to go into the least reached peoples in the world! Will you join... See More — with Betty Lau, Rod Alm, Dorrie Manu, Peggy Yuan Porter and Graham Watt.</p> </div>
<p>Providing contact information (ex. a phone number, email, name of person to contact)</p>	<div data-bbox="831 1012 1425 1302"> <div> <div> Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada shared Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship - IVCF at UVIC's photo. September 5, 2016 · 🌐 </div> </div> <div> <div> Come Join the Movement! Everyone Welcome! Find us online and at clubs days for more info on Kick off events </div> <div> intervarsityuvic @uvicivcf Main Contact: mchurch@ivcf.ca </div> </div> <div> <div> Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship - IVCF at UVIC September 4, 2016 · 🌐 </div> <div>Like Page</div> </div> </div>
<p>Providing information on the organization's products, services, or events (ex. information on missions and campus locations, products available in online store)</p>	<div data-bbox="831 1358 1425 1549"> <div> <div> The Navigators of Canada October 20, 2016 · 🌐 </div> </div> <p>A chill is in the air, and we all know what that means....</p> <p>It's time to layer up with your own Navigator sweater! Available in a wide variety of colours, these sweaters are an excellent way to stay warm and show your Navigator pride!</p> <p>Get yours here: http://navresources.ca/product_details.php...</p> </div>

A.3 Examples of Criteria for Generation of Return Visits Principle

Contests (ex. inviting user to do something for a chance to win)	<div><div> </div></div>
--	---

<p>Inviting user to register, apply, or donate (could be a direct statement or more vague language, ex. “applications are due on ____”, “registration open until ____”, “join us”)</p>	<div data-bbox="834 197 1414 785"> <div> <div> The Navigators of Canada November 29, 2016 · 🌐 </div> </div> <p>It's #GivingTuesday today!</p> <p>Now is the time to partner with us and help support Majd AlAjji and Angel Merhi as they minister to young Canadians in Calgary. They're looking to raise \$5,700 by December 31, 2016</p> <p>Show your support here: http://bit.ly/2gbeNaY</p> </div>
<p>Promotions or discounts (ex. sale, save, tickets are cheapest now, price increase coming)</p>	<div data-bbox="834 829 1414 1541"> <div> <div> Catholic Christian Outreach November 25, 2016 · 🌐 </div> </div> <p>BLACK FRIDAY 3 day sale!</p> <p>Register by 11:59PM PST Sunday Nov. 27th and receive a FREE Limited Edition RISE UP 2016 "Called by Name" t-shirt.</p> <p>Already Registered? We've got you covered. Shirts will go on sale through our CCO store and you can pre-order yours for 50% off by emailing riseup@cco.ca. ONLY \$10. After the 3 DAY SALE cost of the shirts will go up to \$20.</p> <p>*while quantities last</p> <p>Register HERE: http://bit.ly/2c0sms6</p> </div>
<p>Asking the audience to share a post (or similar language, ex. “who could you share this with?”)</p>	<div data-bbox="834 1585 1414 1835"> <div> <div> Power to Change - Students August 2, 2016 · 🌐 </div> </div> <p>How to get involved with Every Student Sunday</p> <p>Step 1: SAY "I'M GOING"</p> <p>Visit our Facebook event and hit "going". Invite your friends. Share the event. Let others know what Every Student Sunday is and that you're praying with us!</p> <p>Find the event here:</p> <p>https://www.facebook.com/events/863746073737355/</p> </div>

A.4 Examples of Criteria for Conservation of Visitors Principle

<p>Links to the organization's other social media profiles (Facebook, Twitter, Vimeo, YouTube, Snapchat), blog, or related website</p>
<p>Asking the audience to “like” a post</p>
<p>Regular posts to the Page</p>	<p>>3 posts per week</p>

Appendix B Criteria for Dialogic Interaction in Comments

B.1 Examples of Criteria for Information Exchange in Comments

<p>User asking a question or raising concern about information in the post</p>	<p>The screenshot shows a Facebook post for an event called 'Rise Up'. The post is by 'Catholic Christian Outreach' and mentions that day passes will go on sale on November 16. A user named 'Evangelina' comments asking for the price for each day separately. The post also includes a photo of a person in a red robe and a link to the event details.</p>
<p>User asking a question or raising concern about the organization</p>	<p>The screenshot shows a Facebook post by 'Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada'. A user named 'Bob' comments asking if they are still allowed in public high schools. The post responds that they are still allowed in public high schools through the sponsorship of a teacher who works in the school.</p>
<p>User tagging another user or Facebook Page in the comments (ex. seeing another user in the photo/video, encouraging people to go to event or apply)</p>	<p>The screenshot shows a Facebook post by 'Bee' with the text 'Last chance at this price! 😊 last chance at this price! Don't miss it, it will be awesome! You don't want to miss it, it'll be awesome! 😊'. The post tags several users: Elizabeth Robyn Alyson Evelyn Sandy Sophie Kristyn Laurie Maya Miriam Sara-Ann Caleb Alex Jessica Marta Nicholas. A user named 'Eric' comments asking if the user is still thinking of coming. The post also includes a photo of a group of people.</p>

B.2 Examples of Criteria for Engaging Conversation in Comments

User thanking the organization for the post (or thanking a person in the post)	Theo Whoa! Talk about a response to a prayer! Definitely well needed in this moment! Thank you for sharing! Like · Reply · 3 · November 15, 2016 at 10:52am
User agreeing with or supporting the organization (ex. user says they are praying, “congratulations”, “amen”, “God bless”, “nice photos”, “good job”)	Courtney Amazing! God bless you! Like · Reply · 1 · December 6, 2016 at 8:19pm Suzy Beautiful testimony! Like · Reply · December 6, 2016 at 8:46am
User contributing something new, sharing their personal thoughts or experiences related to the post (ex. responding to question posed, creating a hashtag, adding information)	Edward Please keep sharing these success stories it warms the heart. Where were you guys when I was in university and heading in the wrong direction? It took me twenty years to find my way. Like · Reply · 2 · December 6, 2016 at 9:05am · Edited

Appendix C Campus Ministry's Facebook Page URL's

1. The Navigators of Canada: <https://www.facebook.com/TheNavigatorsOfCanada/>
2. Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada:
<https://www.facebook.com/intervarsitychristianfellowshipofcanada/>
3. Power to Change – Students: <https://www.facebook.com/p2c.students/>
4. Catholic Christian Outreach: <https://www.facebook.com/ccocampus/>

Bibliography

- “About.” (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ivcf.ca/page.aspx?pid=387>
- “About us.” (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.navigators.ca/about_us.php
- “About us.” (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://p2c.com/students/about-us/>
- “About us.” (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://campusministry.org/about-us>
- American Marketing Association. (2010). *Definition of marketing*. Online.
- Andreason, A. (2012). Rethinking the relationship between social/non-profit marketing and commercial marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 31(1), 36-41.
- Arnett, R. C. (1986). *Communication and community: Implications of Martin Buber's dialogue*. Carbondale: IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Aronczyk, M., & Powers, D. (2010). *Blowing up the brand: Critical perspectives on promotional culture*. New York: P. Lang.
- Arrington, M. (2008). Facebook home page, new Facebook tagline means too many marketing meetings at Facebook. Retrieved from <https://techcrunch.com/2008/09/30/new-facebook-home-page-new-facebook-tagline-means-too-many-marketing-meetings-at-facebook/>
- Barbour, I. G. (1993). *Ethics in an age of technology* (1st ed.). San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Barna Group. (2015). What Millennials want when they visit church. Millennials & Generations. Retrieved from <https://www.barna.com/research/what-millennials-want-when-they-visit-church/>
- Berger, A. A. (2010). *The objects of affection: Semiotics and consumer culture* (1st ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 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.
- Bradley, T. (2011). Drive traffic with Facebook deals. *PC World*, 29(2), 28.
- Broadbent, A., & Omidvar, R. (2011). *Five good ideas: Practical strategies for non-profit success (1st ed.)*. Toronto, ON: Coach House Books.
- Brown, B. A. (2013). Primitive digital accumulation: Privacy, social networks, and biopolitical exploitation. *Rethinking Marxism*, 25(3), 385–403.
- Brown, B. A., & Quan-Haase, A. (2012). “A workers’ inquiry 2.0”: An ethnographic method for the study of produsage in social media contexts. *TripleC*, 10(2), 488–508.
- Buber, M. (1959). *I and thou (2d ed.)*. Edinburgh: Clark.
- Buber, M. (1965). *Between man and man. (R. G. Smith, Trans.)*. New York: Macmillan.
- Buber, M. (1970). *I and Thou (W. Kaufmann, trans.)*. Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York.
- Bucher, T. (2017). The algorithmic imaginary: Exploring the ordinary affects of Facebook algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(1), 30–44.
- Bucher, T. (2012). Want to be on the top? Algorithmic power and the threat of invisibility on Facebook. *New Media & Society*, 14(7), 1164–1180.
- Campbell, H. (2013). *Digital religion: Understanding religious practice in new media worlds*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Campbell, H., & Calderon, P. (2007). The question of Christian community online: The case of the ‘Artist World Network’. *Studies in World Christianity*, 13(3), 261–277.
- “Campus.” (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ivcf.ca/page.aspx?pid=389>
- “Campuses.” (n.d.) Retrieved from <https://cco.ca/our-campus-mission/cco-campuses/>
- Carey, J. W. (1983). Technology and ideology: The case of the telegraph. *Prospects*, 8, 303–325.

- Carr, N. (2008). Is Google making us stupid? *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 107(2), 89-94.
- Carr, N. (2010). *The shallows: What the Internet is doing to our brains* (1st ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Challies, T. (2015). *The next story: Faith, friends, family, and the digital world*. Grand Rapids, IL: Zondervan.
- Cissna, K., & Anderson, R. (1998). Theorizing about dialogic moments: The Buber-Rogers position and postmodern themes. *Communication Theory*, 1, 63-104.
- “Code of professional standards.” (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.cprs.ca/aboutus/code_ethic.aspx
- “Company Info.” (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/>
- Cornwell, T. L. (2008). Advertising: Fueling a passion for consumption. In Schultze, Q. J. & Woods, R. (Eds.), *Understanding evangelical media: the changing face of Christian communication*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Couldry, N., & Turow, J. (2014). Advertising, big data, and the clearance of the public realm: Marketers’ new approaches to the content subsidy. *International Journal of Communication*, 8, 1710-1726.
- Crouch, A. (2008). *Culture making: Recovering our creative calling*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.
- Cullen, S. (2016a). “Overcoming my Elijah complex: How ten other national ministry leaders remind me I’m not alone.” Retrieved from <https://p2c.com/students/overcoming-my-elijah-complex-how-ten-other-national-ministry-leaders-remind-me-im-not-alone/>

- Cullen, S. (2016b). "Why I've stopped calling Power to Change – Students a movement."
Retrieved from <https://p2c.com/students/why-ive-stopped-calling-power-to-change-students-a-movement/>
- Davis, A. (2013). *Promotional cultures: The rise and spread of advertising, public relations, marketing and branding*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Daw, J. S., & Cone, C. (2010). *Breakthrough non-profit branding: Seven principles to power extraordinary results*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Detweiler, C. (2013). *iGods: How technology shapes our spiritual and social lives*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press.
- Durham, S. (2010). *Brandraising*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dyer, G. (1998). *Advertising as communication*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Eisenstein, E. (1979). *The Printing Press as an agent of change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellul, J. (1964). *The technological society* (1st American ed.). New York: Knopf.
- "Expanding your concept of ministry." (n.d.) Retrieved from <https://bible.org/seriespage/1-expanding-your-concept-ministry>
- Facebook. (n.d.). "About." Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/pg/facebook/about/>
- "FAQ." (2012). Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20120913082701/http://www.cccanada.ca/en/the-movement/faq.aspx>
- "Find my campus." (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://p2c.com/students/#block-views-menu-campus-block-home>
- "Find us." (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://www.navigators.ca/staff.php>
- Fish, M. (2009). Showing your face on Facebook. *ABA Bank Marketing*, 41(7), 24-30.

- Flynn, T. (2006). A delicate equilibrium: Balancing theory, practice, and outcomes. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 18(2), 191-201.
- Flynn, T. (2014). Do they have what it takes? A review of the literature on knowledge, competencies, and skills necessary for twenty-first-century public relations practitioners in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 39(3), 361-384.
- Flynn, T., & Sévigny, A. (2009). The paradox of public relations/communications management education in Canada: Taught but not studied. *The McMaster Journal of Communication*, 6(1), 7-12.
- Ford, D. (1999). *Theology: A very short introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Freakonomics Radio. (2016, July 13). Is the Internet being ruined? *Freakonomics Radio*. Podcast retrieved from <http://www.wnyc.org/story/internet-being-ruined/>
- Fussell Sisco, H., & McCorkindale, T. (2013). Communicating “pink”: An analysis of the communication strategies, transparency, and credibility of breast cancer social media sites. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 18(4), 287-301.
- Gray, J. (2010). Texts that sell: The culture in promotional culture. In M. Aronczyk & D. Powers (Eds.), *Blowing up the brand: Critical perspectives on promotional culture* (pp. 307-326). New York: P. Lang.
- Greenberg, J., & Macaulay, M. (2009). NPO 2.0? Exploring the Web presence of environmental nonprofit organizations in Canada. *Global Media Journal – Canadian Edition*, 2(1), 63-88.
- Greenwood, S., Perrin, A., & Duggan, M. (2016). Social media update 2016. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/11/11/social-media-update->

2016/

- Grunig, J.E., & Grunig, L. A. (1989). Toward a theory of the public relations behavior of organizations. *Public Relations Research Annual, 1*, 27-66.
- Grunig, J.E., & Grunig, L. A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. In J.E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. (pp. 285-325). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. New York: Hold, Rinehart & Winston.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action* (Vol. 1, T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon.
- Hadden, J. K., & Cowan, D. E. (2000). *Religion on the Internet: research prospects and promises*. New York: JAI.
- Halavais, A. (2014). Teaching and learning with social media. In J. Husinger & T. Senft (Eds.), *The social media handbook* (pp. 93-106). New York: Routledge.
- Hearn, A. (2010). Structuring feeling: Web 2.0, online ranking and rating, and the digital 'reputation' economy". *Ephemera, 10*(3), 421-438.
- "History." (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ivcf.ca/page.aspx?pid=386>
- Højsgaard, M. T., & Warburg, M. (2005). *Religion and cyberspace*. Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- "Home." (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ivcf.ca/page.aspx?pid=291>
- Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations*. Gainesville, FL: Institution for Public Relations.
- Ingenhoff, D., & Koelling, M. (2007). The potential of Web sites as a relationship building tool

- for charitable fundraising NPOs. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 66-73.
- Innis, H. (1950). *Empire and communication*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Innis, H. (1951). *The bias of communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jhally, S. (1987). *The codes of advertising: Fetishism and the political economy of meaning in the consumer society*. New York: Routledge.
- Johannesen, R. L. (1971). The emerging concept of communication as dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 57(4), 373-382
- Johansen, P. (2001). Professionalisation, building respectability, and the birth of the Canadian Public Relations Society. *Journalism Studies*, 2(1), 55-71.
- Kanter, B., & Fine, A. H. (2010). *The networked non-profit: Connecting with social media to drive change*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Katz, J., & Rice, R. (2002). *Social consequences of Internet use: Access, involvement and interaction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Keller, T. (2009). *Counterfeit Gods: The empty promises of money, sex, and power, and the only hope that matters*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Keller, H. (2013). *You really like me: Dialogic social media use in organizational communication*. Thesis from Gonzaga University.
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web. *Public Relations Review*, 24(3), 321-334.
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 28(1), 21-37
- Kent, M. L., Taylor, M., & White, W. (2003). The relationship between Web site design and organizational responsiveness to stakeholders. *Public Relations Review*, 29, 63-77.

- Kerr, P. A. (2008). Promoting public relations in a new media environment. In Q. J. Schultze & R. Woods (Eds.), *Understanding evangelical media: the changing face of Christian communication*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Kidd, N. (2015). *What is Campus Ministry, Anyway?* National Campus Ministry Association. Retrieved from <http://www.campusministry.net/blog-2/what-is-camus-ministry-anyway/>
- Kinnaman, D. (2011). *You lost me: Why young Christians are leaving the church...And rethinking faith*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Kinnaman, D., & Lyons, G. (2012). *UnChristian: What a new generation really thinks about Christianity...And why it matters*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Knight, G. (2010). Activism, branding, and the promotional public sphere. In M. Aronczyk & D. Powers (Eds.), *Blowing up the brand: Critical perspectives on promotional culture* (pp. 173-193). New York: P. Lang.
- “Know our ministries.” (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://p2c.com/know/#know-our-ministries>
- Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D., & Graepel, T. (2013). Private traits and attributes are predictable from digital records of human behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(15), 5802–5805.
- Kousser, F., & Rushkoff, D. (Writer). Rushkoff, D. (Director). (2014) Generation Like [Television Series Episode]. In R. Aronson-Rath (Producer), *Frontline*. Arlington, VA :PBS
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, N., & Kotler, P. (2016). *Social marketing: Changing behaviours for good*. USA: SAGE Publications.

- Linville, D., McGee, S., & Hicks, L. (2012). Colleges' and universities' use of Twitter: A content analysis. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 636-638.
- Lovejoy, K., Waters, R., & Saxton, G. (2012). Engaging stakeholders through Twitter: How non-profit organizations are getting more out of 140 characters or less. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 313-318.
- Lovink, G. (2011). *Networks without a cause: A critique of social media*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Luca, P. (2011). Social media dialogue: An analysis of the social media presence of selected Fortune 500 companies. Thesis from Liberty University.
- Lundby, K. (2013). Theoretical frameworks for approaching religion and new media. In H. Campbell (Eds.), *Digital religion: Understanding religious practice in new media worlds* (pp. 225-237). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Malcolm Gladwell. (2010, Mar). *Canadian Business*, 83, 57-58. Retrieved from <http://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/docview/864296877?accountid=9894>
- "Map." (n.d.). Retrived from <http://www.ivcf.ca/map>
- Martino, L. M. S. (2013). *The mediatization of religion: When faith rocks*. Burlington, VT; Farnham, Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- McAllister-Spooner, S. M. (2009) Fulfilling the dialogic promise: A ten-year reflective survey on dialogic Internet principles. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 320-322.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1212-1241.
- McChesney, R. W. (2014). *Digital disconnect: How capitalism is turning the Internet against*

- democracy*. New York, NY: New Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Me and My Shadow. (2016). "Detox your digital self." Retrieved from <https://myshadow.org/detox>
- Miriam Webster Dictionary. (n.d.). Definition of nonprofit. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nonprofit>
- Miriam Webster Dictionary. (n.d.). Definition of parable. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/parable>
- "Mission". (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.cprs.ca/aboutus/mission.aspx>
- Mitcham, C. (1994). *Thinking through technology: The path between engineering and philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moe, H. (2008). Dissemination and dialogue in the public sphere: A case for public service media online. *Media, Culture & Society*, 30(3), 319-336.
- Monsma, S. (1986). *Responsible technology: A Christian perspective*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Mottner, S. (2008). Marketing and Religion. In A. Sargeant & W. Wymer (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to nonprofit marketing* (pp. 92-107). New York;London;: Routledge.
- Muckensturm, E. (2013). *Using dialogic principles on Facebook: How the accommodation sector is communicating with its consumers*. Thesis from Clemson University.
- "Multicultural/Multi-ethnic ministry." (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ivcf.ca/page.aspx?pid=389>
- Musser, J., & O'Reilly, T. (2007). *Web 2.0: Principles and best practices*. Sebastopol, Calif:

- O'Reilly Media.
- Neff, J. (2010). What happens when Facebook trumps your brand site?. *Advertising Age*, 81(30), 2-22.
- Neiger, B., Thackeray, R., Van Wagenen, S., Hanson, C. L., West, J., Barnes, M., & Fagen, M. (2012). Use of social media in health promotion: Purposes, key performance indicators, and evaluation metrics. *Health Promotion Practice*, 13(159), 159-164.
- O'Neill, N. (2008). What is Facebook's slogan saying. Retrieved from <http://www.adweek.com/digital/what-is-facebooks-slogan-saying/>
- Olsson, E., & Eriksson, M. (2016). The logic of public organizations' social media use: Toward a theory of 'social mediatization'. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 5(2), 187-204.
- "Our global family." (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://p2c.com/students/about-us/our-global-family/>
- "Our history." (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.navigators.ca/about_our_history.php
- Paulin, M., Ferguson, R., Jost, N., & Fallu, J. (2014). Motivating millennials to engage in charitable causes through social media. *Journal of Service Management*, 25(3), 334-348.
- Pempek, T. A., Yermolayeva, Y. A., & Calvert, S. L. (2009). College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30, 227-238.
- Peters, J. D. (1999). *Speaking into the air: A history of the idea of communication*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Peters, J. D. (2006). Communication as dissemination. In G. Shepherd, J. St. John, & T. Striplas, (Eds.), *Communication as...Perspectives on theory* (pp. 211-222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peters, J. D. (2015). *The Marvelous clouds: toward a philosophy of elemental media*. Chicago:

- University of Chicago Press.
- Postman, N. (1992). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology* (1st ed.). New York: Knopf.
- Powell, H. (2013). *Promotional culture and convergence: Markets, methods, media*. New York: Routledge.
- “Purpose.” (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ivcf.ca/page.aspx?pid=388>
- Reagan, G. (2009). The evolution of Facebook’s mission statement. Retrieved from <http://observer.com/2009/07/the-evolution-of-facebooks-mission-statement/>
- Rybalko, S., & Seltzer, T. (2010). Dialogic communication in 140 characters or less: How *Fortune 500* companies engage stakeholders using Twitter. *Public Relations Review*, 36, 336-341.
- Saunders, J. (2015). “The place and purpose of parachurch ministries.” *The Gospel Coalition*. Retrieved from <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/parachurch-ministry>
- Schou, J., & Farkas, J. (2016). Algorithms, interfaces, and the circulation of information: Interrogating the epistemological challenges of Facebook. *KOME – An International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry*, 4(1), 36-49.
- Schultze, Q. J. (2008). Following Pilgrims into Cyberspace. In Q. J. Schultze & R. Woods (Eds.), *Understanding evangelical media: the changing face of Christian communication*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Schultze, Q. J., & Woods, R. (2008). *Understanding evangelical media: The changing face of Christian communication*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.
- Schuurman, D. (2013). *Shaping a digital world: faith, culture and computer technology*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.

- Sévigny, A., & Flynn, T. (2011). A reflection on the evolution of the field of professional communication. *Journal of Professional Communication*, 1(1), 3-14.
- Smith, M. (2007). Nonprofit religious organization Web sites: underutilized avenue of communicating with group members. *Journal of Media and Religion*, 6(4), 273-290.
- Smith, T. (2009) The social media revolution. *International journal of market research*, 51(4), 559-561.
- “Spiritual multiplication.” (2013). Retrieved from <https://p2c.com/students/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/A-Snapshot-of-Spiritual-Multiplication1.pdf>
- Stelzner, M. A. (2016). *2016 social media marketing industry report: How marketers are using social media to grow their businesses*. Social Media Examiner. Retrieved from <http://www.socialmediaexaminer.com>.
- Stoker, K. L., & Tusinski, K. A. (2006). Reconsidering Public Relations’ infatuation with dialogue: Why engagement and reconciliation can be more ethical than symmetry and reciprocity. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 21(2-3), 156-176.
- Stolow, J. (2005). Religion and/as media. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22(4), 119-145.
- Stolow, J. (2013). *Deus in machina: Religion, technology and the things in between*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Strider, B. (2012). “Like Families and Soccer Teams: Church and Parachurch.” *The Gospel Coalition*. Retrieved from <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/like-families-and-soccer-teams-church-and-parachurch>
- Sweetser, K. D., & Lariscy, R. W. (2008). Candidates make good friends: An analysis of candidates' uses of Facebook. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 2(3), 175-198.

- Taylor, M., & Kent, M. L. (2014). Dialogic engagement: Clarifying foundational concepts. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 26, 384-398.
- Taylor, M., Kent, M. L., & White, W. (2001). How activist organizations are using the Internet to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 27, 263-284.
- Theunissen, P., & Wan Noordin, W. N. (2010). Revisiting the concept “dialogue” in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 5–13.
- Tolliston, T. (2015). *Campus Ministry Today and the Great Commission*. Campus Ministry Today. Retrieved from <http://campusministry.org/article/campus-ministry-today-and-the-great-commission>
- Traven, B. (2014). Facebook is throttling nonprofits and activists. *Valleywag*. Retrieved from <http://valleywag.gawker.com/facebook-is-throttling-nonprofits-and-activists-1569877170>
- Tufekci, Z. (2012). Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency. *Colorado Technology Law Journal*, 13(2), 203-218.
- Tufekci, Z. (2014). Engineering the public: Big data, surveillance and computational politics. *First Monday*, 19(7), 1-39.
- Tufekci, Z. (2016). As the pirates become CEOs: The closing of the open Internet. *Daedalus, the Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences*, 145(1), 65-78.
- Tuten, T. L., & Solomon, M. R. (2013). *Social media marketing*. Boston: Pearson.
- Van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dijck, J. (2012). Facebook and the engineering of connectivity: A multi-layered approach to social media platforms. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 19(2), 141-155.

- Walther, J. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1992). Relational communication in computer-mediated interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 19(1) 50-88.
- 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.
- Waters, R. D., & Jamal, J. Y. (2011) Tweet, tweet, tweet: A content analysis of non-profit organizations' Twitter updates. *Public Relations Review*, 37(3), 321-324.
- Waters, R. D., & Lo, K. (2012). Exploring the impact of culture in the social media sphere: A content analysis of nonprofit organizations' use of Facebook. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 41(3), 297-319.
- Wernick, A. (1991). *Promotional Culture: Advertising, Ideology, and Symbolic Expression*. UK: Sage Publications.
- Winner, L. (1980). Do artefacts have politics? *Daedalus*, 109(1), 121-136.
- Webb, L. M, Wilson, M. L., Hodges, M., Smith, P. A., & Zakeri, M. (2012). Facebook: How College Students Work It. In H. S. Noor Al-Deen & J. A. Hendricks (Eds.), *Social media: Usage and impact* (pp. 3-22). UK: Lexington Books.
- “What is our dream?” (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://p2c.com/students/about-us/what-is-our-dream/>
- “Who are our people?” (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://p2c.com/students/about-us/who-are-our-people/>
- “Who we are.” (n.d.) Retrieved from <https://cco.ca/who-we-are/>
- “Who we are.” (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.navigators.ca/about_who_we_are.php
- Wymer, W. (2013). The influence of marketing scholarship's legacy on non-profit marketing.

International Journal of Financial Studies, 1, 102-118.

- Wymer, W., Boenigk, S., & Möhlmann, M. (2015). The conceptualization of non-profit marketing orientation: A critical reflection and contributions toward closing the practice-theory gap. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 27(2), 117-134.
- Yaros, R. A. (2012). Social Media in Education: Effects of personalization and interactivity on engagement and collaboration. In H. S. Noor Al-Deen & J. A. Hendricks (Eds.), *Social media: Usage and impact* (pp. 57-74). UK: Lexington Books.