

**Using Contents to Improve Social Media Engagement on Sina  
Weibo: Case HAMK**



Bachelor's thesis

Degree Programme in International Business

Valkeakoski

Autumn 2018

Xiaojia Li

International Business  
Valkeakoski

---

<b>Author</b>	Xiaoja Li	<b>Year</b> 2018
<b>Subject</b>	Using Contents to Improve Social Media Engagement on Sina Weibo: Case HAMK	
<b>Supervisor(s)</b>	Markus Ossi, Iris Humala	

---

ABSTRACT

This thesis is commissioned by HAMK. HAMK is the abbreviation and brand name for Häme University of Applied Sciences. It is a multidisciplinary higher education institution located in Hämeenlinna, Finland. As part of its international marketing project for the Chinese market, HAMK started its presence on the Chinese social media outlet Sina Weibo in October 2014. The purpose of this thesis was to find out for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, how content types and characteristics influenced social media engagement, especially the engagement of sharing. Therefore, HAMK can utilize this study result to improve its social media engagement performance on Sina Weibo in the future.

Besides researching and reviewing the relevant literature, the author also conducted a case study as empirical research. Based on the method of content analysis, the case study analysed a total of 412 contents on Sina Weibo published from five foreign universities including HAMK.

The findings showed different content types and different content characteristics had a different influence on social media engagement, also on the engagement of sharing for foreign universities for Sina Weibo, and certain types and characteristics had a higher positive or negative influence.

This study contributes to the existing knowledge of using contents to improve social media engagement. It especially provides insight for the commissioning university HAMK for its possible plan to improve the social media engagement on Sina Weibo in the future.

**Keywords** Social Media Engagement, Sina Weibo, University Marketing, Content

**Pages** 56 pages + appendices 14 pages

# CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	HAMK and Sina Weibo.....	1
1.3	Research Question and Objectives.....	2
1.4	Research Structure.....	3
1.5	Research Methods.....	3
2	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
2.1	Introduction.....	5
2.2	Content with Content Marketing.....	5
2.2.1	Content Marketing.....	5
2.2.2	Content with Content Marketing.....	6
2.3	Content with Social Media Engagement.....	6
2.3.1	Social Media Marketing.....	7
2.3.2	Social Media Engagement.....	7
2.3.3	Social Media Engagement Strategy.....	9
2.3.4	Social Media Engagement Types and Behaviours.....	9
2.3.5	Sharing and Berger's STEPPS Principle.....	12
2.3.6	Factors Influencing Social Media Engagement.....	13
2.3.7	Content Types with Social Media Engagement.....	14
2.3.8	Content Characteristics with Social Media Engagement.....	16
2.4	Summary of the Literature.....	18
3	EMPIRICAL RESEARCH.....	20
3.1	Methodology.....	20
3.2	Content Analysis.....	20
3.2.1	Data Collection.....	21
3.2.2	Data Analysis.....	26
3.1.3.1	Variables, Coding Scheme and Coding Results.....	26
3.1.3.2	Method for Analysing Coding Results.....	32
4	FINDINGS.....	36
4.1	Introduction.....	36
4.1.1	Findings in the Four Case Universities.....	36
4.1.2	Findings in the Commissioning University.....	37
4.2	Summary of Findings.....	38
5	DISCUSSION.....	41
5.1	Examinations of Research Findings.....	41
5.1.1	Examination of Findings for Subquestion 1.....	41
5.1.2	Examination of Findings for Subquestion 2.....	43
5.1.3	Answer to the Research Question.....	47
5.2	Contributions and Managerial Implications.....	48
5.2.1	Contributions.....	48

5.2.2	Managerial Implications.....	50
5.3	Limitations and Directions.....	51
5.3.1	Limitations .....	51
5.3.2	Directions for Future Study .....	52
	REFERENCES.....	54
Appendices		
Appendix 1	Content Pool of Group A	
Appendix 2	Content Pool of Group B	
Appendix 3	Content Pool of Group C	
Appendix 4	Coding Result for Study of Sharing	
Appendix 5	Coding Result for Study of Commenting	
Appendix 6	Coding Result for Study of Liking	

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

In recent years, content marketing and social media marketing have become two of the most famous buzzwords in the marketing realm.

It has been claimed that “content is the present – and future – of marketing” (Content Marketing Institute n.d.), and “engagement is the very essence of social media” (Tuten & Solomon 2015, 187).

But “engaged audience do not come free, but have to be earned” (Fieseler 2015). So more and more companies are using contents to improve their marketing performance on social media, especially to improve the performance of engagement.

To be specific for educational industry, Peruta & Shields (2018) claimed that more and more colleges and universities are also using social media marketing as one of the most important part of their marketing strategies with the major purpose being student recruitment, student retention, creating visibility and building trust.

Many foreign universities have been using social media for marketing in their international market. In the Chinese market one of the most commonly used social media outlets for foreign universities is Sina Weibo. HAMK started its presence on Sina Weibo in October 2014, and as of 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2018, it has had 222 posts, 344 followers.

This thesis was commissioned by HAMK. The scope of this research was to find out for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, how content types and characteristics influenced social media engagement, especially the engagement of sharing.

## 1.2 HAMK and Sina Weibo

HAMK is the abbreviation and brand name for Häme University of Applied Sciences. It is a multidisciplinary higher education institution located in Hämeenlinna in Finland. It has 625 teachers and other staff, 7200 students in 7 campuses. It offers 31 degree programmes, of which 5 are delivered in English. Currently, HAMK has a presence on several social media platforms, including Facebook, Flickr, Instagram, Twitter, Youtube, Pinterest. (HAMK n.d.).

For Chinese students, currently HAMK has four bachelor-level degree programmes available. They are Construction Engineering, Electrical and

Automation Engineering, International Business, and Mechanical Engineering and Production Technology. (HAMK n.d.)

In October 2017, HAMK signed an agreement with the Chinese International Vocational Education Platform (IVEP) to improve China's vocational education and universities of applied sciences (HAMK n.d.).

Sina Weibo is a Chinese micro-blogging website launched in 2009. It is one of the most popular social media platforms in China. "Weibo" is the Chinese pinyin meaning micro blogging. (Wikipedia 2018.)

From an individual point of view, Sina Weibo is the platform for people to create, share and discover content online. It provides self-expression, social interaction, content aggregation and content distribution. In Sina Weibo any users can create posts, follow others, comment on others' content and repost. From a marketer's point of view, Sina Weibo offers a wide range of marketing and advertising solutions for companies of all sizes. (Weibo n.d.)

### 1.3 Research Question and Objectives

This research was conducted to find out how content types and characteristics influenced social media engagement, especially the engagement of sharing for foreign universities on Sina Weibo. Therefore, the primary research question of this thesis is the following:

"For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, how content types and characteristics influenced social media engagement, especially the engagement of sharing?"

The primary research question is supported by two subquestions:

Question 1: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content types had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

Question 2: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content characteristics had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

The main purpose of this thesis was to find out for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, how content types and characteristics influenced social media engagement, especially the engagement of sharing. Therefore, HAMK can utilize this research result to improve its social media engagement performance on Sina Weibo in the future.

The main objectives of this research were:

- To gain a deeper understanding of the influence different content types and characteristics had on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing for foreign universities on Sina Weibo.
- To identify which content types and characteristics had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing for foreign universities on Sina Weibo.

#### 1.4 Research Structure

This thesis contains five different chapters.

The first chapter explains the background of the thesis, introduces the commissioning university and its current situation, and then defines the research questions, research objectives, research structure and research methods.

The second chapter views the relevant literature which contains two parts. The first part briefly introduces content marketing and content from content marketing's perspective. The second part introduces social media engagement and the related concepts, and then ends with definitions and major findings about contents from social media engagement's perspective.

The third chapter describes the empirical research the author conducted for this thesis. It was a case study which contained a study of the contents from four foreign universities on Sina Weibo and also the contents published in an experiment for the commissioning university.

The fourth chapter presents the findings of the whole case study which contains the findings from the four foreign universities and also the findings from the commissioning university.

The last chapter addresses the key research results. It examines the key case study findings with literature, addresses the contributions and managerial implications of the research, and closes with limitations of the research and suggestions for the future study.

#### 1.5 Research Methods

In this thesis, the author used two research methods.

First, the author used desk research to get the relevant literature, which included books, journals, and other forms of information. The author viewed the relevant literature and got the theoretical framework for the research.

Second, the author conducted an empirical research which was a case study.

Five foreign universities were chosen for the case study. One was the commissioning university, the others were four foreign universities which were having good social media engagement performance on Sina Weibo. One of them was from the United States (US), one was from the United Kingdom (UK) and the other two were from Finland.

The whole case study was based on the method of content analysis. Total 412 contents from the five universities were analysed and 86 contents were defined from the perspective of content type and also from the perspective of content characteristic.

By analysing the performance of the contents, the author indentified the influence different content types and different content characteristics had on social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo. Based on this, the author indentified the types and characteristics which had a higher positive or negative influence.



## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the relevant literature. It contains two parts. In the first part, it briefly introduces content marketing and content from content marketing's perspective. In the second part, it introduces social media engagement and the related concepts, and then ends with definitions and major findings about contents from social media engagement's perspective.

### 2.2 Content with Content Marketing

Before introducing content from content marketing's perspective, this part introduces content marketing first.

#### 2.2.1 Content Marketing

- Definition of Content Marketing

Content marketing is not new. The commonly recognized version about the beginning of content marketing is that in 1895 when John Deere publishing a magazine called *Furrow*. Instead of being filled with commercials, this magazine provided practical information for the farmers. And it turned about to be a big success for John Deere. After that, content marketing become popular. More and more companies are using content marketing as one of their most important marketing techniques. (Content Marketing Institute n.d.)

According to Du Plessis (2017, 42) the first academic study about content marketing was published in 2008. It was from Jennifer Rowley, a scholar at Manchester Metropolitan University.

To the author' knowledge so far there have been different definitions about content marketing both from practitioners' side and scholars' side. Their definitions mainly depend on the own point of view and background. Among these definitions, the most popular version which has received the recognition from both the practitioners' side and scholars' side is the definition from Content Marketing Institute, which is:

Content marketing is a strategic marketing approach focused on creating and distributing valuable, relevant, and consistent content to attract and retain a clearly-defined audience – and, ultimately, to drive profitable customer action. (Content Marking Institute n.d.)

- Advantages of Content Marketing

In traditional marketing companies have to “rent” the attention from medias which have already built attention from the audience. For example, when a company is placing an advertisement on TV, the company is “renting” the attention from that TV channel. While by using content marketing, the company can be the publisher itself, instead of “renting” attention from others. So companies can build their own audiences, attract their own attention. (Marteko 2014, 7.)

Marteko (2014, 7) claimed that as a specific marketing technique, content marketing has three major advantages, which are:

- First, content marketing can build organic brand awareness for the company. When the content ranks high on the search engine or gets shared, it is building “free” and organic brand awareness for the company. (Marteko 2014, 7.)
- Second, content marketing can build and maintain relationship with the audience for the company. People tend to buy products from companies whom they already have a good relationship with. (Marteko 2014, 7.)
- Third, from the audience’s point of view, traditional marketing is interrupting or intercepting which is annoying for them. But content marketing is building a natural conversation between the company and the audience. (Marteko 2014, 7.)

### 2.2.2 Content with Content Marketing

From both practitioners’ side and scholars’ side the importance of a good content in content marketing has been emphasized. For example, Marteko (2014, 7) claimed that companies have to provide contents audience like or even love. Scholars, Pažėraitė and Repovienė (2016, 105) after a theoretical analysis of content marketing also claimed that content marketing is based on high quality content.

Concerning what is a good content from the perspective of content marketing, from the theoretical point of view, Pažėraitė and Repovienė (2016, 105) claimed that according to the findings of previous researchers a good content should have these characteristics, which are: relevance, informative, reliability, value, uniqueness, emotion and intelligence.

### 2.3 Content with Social Media Engagement

Previous chapter introduced content marketing and content from content marketing’s point of view. This chapter is mainly about social

media engagement and content from social media engagement' point of view.

It first introduces the background of social media engagement, which is social media and social media marketing. Then it introduces social media engagement and the related concepts. At the end it presents contents from social media engagement' point of view with the focus of definitions and major findings about how different types and characteristics influence contents' social media engagement performance.

### 2.3.1 Social Media Marketing

Social media has been defined in many ways from many different perspectives. For example, Meikle (2015, 22) defined social media in a very general way as "networked data platforms that combine public with personal communication".

Tuten and Solomon (2015, 22) defined social media as:

Online means of communication, conveyance, collaboration, and cultivation among interconnected and independent networks of people, community, and organizations enhanced by technological capabilities and mobility.

Tuten and Solomon (2015, 24) explained that social media provide people the ability to connect people and organizations freely and easily. It makes it possible that people can have easy access to contents and share them freely with their connections. Social media also provide people the opportunities for all kinds of online participation.

Based on their understanding of social media, Tuten and Solomon (2015, 41) defined social media marketing as:

The utilization of social media technologies, channels, and software to create, communicate, deliver, and exchange offerings that have value for an organization's stakeholders.

### 2.3.2 Social Media Engagement

To be specific on social media, in recent years, the amount of contents on social media has been exploding. So when organizations and individuals are posting and sharing more and more contents on social media, the possibility of being reached and the influence of the content itself decreases. Peruta and Shields (2018) claimed that according to Sprinklr (2014) for the content which is not paid for promotion on a platform, the number of its organic reach on the platform is about two percentage of

the page's total followers. For example, if the page has one hundred followers, an organic content will reach to two audiences.

But social media engagement can help the contents get more organic reach. The more engaged the content gets, including clicking, liking, commenting, or sharing, the more organic reach the content can get. (Peruta & Shields 2018.)

“Engagement is the very essence of social media” (Tuten & Solomon 2015, 187).

There are many conceptualizations of social media engagement. In this thesis, the author adopted the concept from McCay-Peet and Quan-Haase (2016, 200) that social media engagement is:

A quality of user experience with web-based technologies that enable users to interact with, create, and share content with individuals and organizations in their social networks.

- 90-9-1 Rule

One of the most significant characteristics about social media engagement is that social media engagement is not uniformly distributed (Khan 2017, 237). One of the most popular concepts about this characteristic about social media engagement is the 90-9-1 rule from Nielsen.

Nielsen (2006) claimed that in most online communities, user participation more or less follows a 90-9-1 rule, which means 90% of the users are lurkers or passive users who read or observe the online content but do not contribute; 9% of the users contribute once in a while, only 1% users contribute for most contributions, and in the blog realm, the rule is more like 95-5-0.1.

Scholars have tried to find the reason for this phenomenon. For example, Chwialkowska (2017,132) claimed that lurking is driven by the motive of getting informational or monetary benefits.

Khan (2017, 237) suggested that in order to have a whole picture of social media engagement, both participation and lurking should be taken into consideration for the company. His opinion is consistent with other scholar's opinion. For example, Syrdal (2016, 34) claimed that though people do not perform participation, they might have some offline engagement behaviours, for example, spreading positive offline word-of-mouth about the company. These offline engagement behaviours are contributing to marketing performance for the company as well.

### 2.3.3 Social Media Engagement Strategy

“Engaged audience do not come free, but have to be earned” (Fieseler 2015).

Fieseler (2015) from users’ motives’ point of view, claimed that there are four strategies companies can use to improve their social media engagement, they are:

- Harnessing the Social Motive: One of the reasons people engage with the company on social media is to build new social relationships with other audiences. So companies can improve the audiences’ engagement on social media by improving the conversational functions on social media where audience can social with others. (Fieseler 2015.)
- Harnessing the Hedonic Motive: Another reason people engage with the company on social media is fun. So companies can provide entertaining contents, for example, competitions, games or other playful activities which can provide the initial spark for the audience and get them engaged. But in order to maintain long term engagement, harnessing hedonic motives is not enough. (Fieseler 2015.)
- Harnessing the Learning Motive: This strategy is based on people’s habit of liking to learn new things. So there are certain amount of people who decide to engage with the company on social media because they would like to learn new things. It can be learning from the company or learning from the other users, for example, other people’s comments on the contents. When to apply this strategy companies should use contents which can provide new things to meet the audiences’ need to learn. (Fieseler 2015.)
- Harnessing the Moral Motive: People tend to feel certain responsibility to engage especially when they see the company is contributing to the community. Bases on this motive, the company can keep making contributions to the online community in order to get audience be more engaged with the company. (Fieseler 2015.)

### 2.3.4 Social Media Engagement Types and Behaviours

- Social Media Engagement Types

Social media engagement can be divided in different types. To the author’s knowledge the three most commonly used ways are categorizing social media engagement by valence, by strength and by both of valence and strength at the same time.

### **By Valence**

By valence, social media engagement can be divided into positive engagement and negative engagement. Positive engagement means the engagement has positive influences both in short and long term run for the company and it can be reflected in the users' favourable behaviours. While negative engagement refers to the engagement has the negative effect on the company and it can be reflected in users' unfavourable behaviours. (D. Hollebeek & Chen 2014, 62.)

### **By Strength**

Scholars have used different ways to categorize social media engagement types by strength.

According to Khan (2017, 237) by strength, social media engagement can be divided into two types, participation and consumption. Participation means the click-based actions, including liking, commenting and sharing. While consumption means simply viewing or reading of the company's posts or other people's comments on the posts without liking, commenting or sharing. He defined participation as the active engagement activity, while consumption as the passive activity.

Malthouse, Haenlein, Skiera, Wege and Zhang (2013, 272) divided social media engagement into two different levels, they are: lower level engagement and lower level engagement. Lower level engagement refers to the situation when the users only passively consume the contents or easily contribute to the contents. Higher level engagement refers to the situation when the users actively participate with the contents, such as commenting, or sharing.

### **By Valence and Strength**

Some scholars categorized social media engagement behaviours by combining valence and strength together.

For example, Dolan (2015, 62-71) proposed a construct for it. Under this construct, she claimed that there are six types of social media engagement, they are creating, contributing, consuming, dormancy, detaching and destructing.

- **Social Media Engagement Behaviours**

Among all the engagement behaviours, the most discussed behaviours are: liking, commenting and sharing. Compared with the other three behaviours, the author noticed that there have been more studies about sharing.

## **Liking**

Liking refers to the action of liking the given content by clicking the “like” button.

From users’ motive’s point of view, key motive for liking is to express the user’s own support and appreciation to the content (Chwialkowska 2017, 132).

Liking is an attitudinal response (Stephen, Sciandra, & Inman 2015, 19). It belongs to lower level engagement (Malthouse et al. 2013, 272) or medium level (Dolan 2015, 56).

Even liking is a lower level engagement behaviour, it is still meaningful for the company. Because liking is showing audience’s opinion about the content, such as clicking the buttons of “like”, “love”, or “thumb up”. But it only delivers little information about what the audience’s opinion about the contents since it is too easy for the audience to make an attitudinal response, such as just clicking the “like” button. This is the reason why liking is called the lower level engagement. (Stephen et al. 2015, 19.)

Malthouse et al. (2013, 272) claimed that even though liking is carrying little information of the audience, it still may lead to some positive outcome for the company. Because the audience’s attitudinal response might be observed by his or her connections on the social media platform. Then it is possible that the connections may start to have higher level engagement with the company or even turn to be customers for the company in the future.

## **Commenting**

Commenting refers to the action of leaving comments to the given content.

From the point of view of audience’s motives, key motives for people commenting are to be in touch with other online connections who have mentioned the contents or to acquire more product information (Chwialkowska 2017, 132).

According to Stephen et al. (2015, 20) commenting means feedback, compared with liking it belongs to higher level engagement. Dolan (2015, 56) claimed that commenting belongs to the highest level of social media engagement, even higher than sharing. Because commenting is not only about contributing but also about creating. Villi and Matikainen (2016, 112) claimed that compared with sharing, commenting is more time-consuming.

### 2.3.5 Sharing and Berger's STEPPS Principle

Sharing refers to the action of forwarding the given content to other people.

According to Villi and Matikainen (2016, 112), sharing is a referral activity. Because sharing means the audience is recommending his or her connections on the social media to consume the content too. They believed that sharing will leads to horizontal distribution of the content. Chwialkowska (2017, 8) claimed that according to Gode and Mayzlin (2009), company's contents which are shared by other online users are more persuasive than the contents posted directly by the company itself. So she claimed that sharing is the most difficult social media engagement for the company to achieve.

"Sharing is the heart of social media" (Meikle 2015, 24).

Scholars have tried to find out what are the factors which drive sharing. For example, from the audience's motives' point of view, Chwialkowska (2017, 132) claimed key motive for sharing is to provide benefits to users' online connections.

One of the most popular literature about sharing is Berger's STEPPS principle. It provides six characteristics for anything which succeeds in getting popular. This principle is not specifically for social media contents only, but it has been widely used in the study of marketing, especially in the study of viral marketing.

- Berger's STEPPS Principle

According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed that there are six key factors drive people to share or spread things. He named it as STEPPS principle. Under STEPPS principle, the six key factors are:

- Social Currency: The idea of social currency is that people tend to share things which can make them look good. That is the reason people share cool things. For example, people like to share the picture of an extraordinarily expensive meal they just had rather than an ordinal priced meal. (FightMediocrity 2015.)
- Trigger: The idea of trigger is that people need to be reminded. So the more frequently people are reminded of the thing, the higher possibility the thing will get shared. For example, the video about Friday gets more amount of sharing than the video about first school day. It is because every Friday people are reminded of the first video while very year or half a year people are reminded of the other video. Friday is a strong trigger while first school day is a weak trigger. (FightMediocrity 2015.)



- Emotion: The more emotional aroused the person gets from the thing the more possible he or she will share the thing. The higher emotional aroused the thing is, the more sharing it will get. Both positive and negative emotions can lead to higher amount of sharing, but the negative emotion of sadness leads to low sharing. (FightMediocrity 2015.)
- Public: People tend to imitate other people who are around them. If people around them are doing the same thing, it means this thing is safe and popular. So people are less worried about the uncertainty of doing the same thing. For example, if the neighbours are buying new cars, people tend to buy new cars as well. (FightMediocrity 2015.)
- Practical Value: Instead of judging the information, people like to spread useful information, just to help others. Whether the information is valuable or not is from the view of the people who receive the information. So the more practically useful the thing is, the more sharing it gets. (FightMediocrity 2015.)
- Story: People do not like to talk about technical details, but they like to talk about stories. So if the thing is wrapped into some cool stories, it has higher possibility to be shared. (FightMediocrity 2015.)

### 2.3.6 Factors Influencing Social Media Engagement

The author noticed that scholars have provided their findings about the factors which have influence on social media engagement behaviours from different perspectives. To the author's knowledge, two of the most discussed factors are: culture and age.

The cultural factors do not only influence the way how people are using social media but also influence the way how people are reacting to the contents in social media (Dahl 2015, 394). Chwialkowska (2017, 163) claimed that people's social media engagement behaviours, especially the active engagement behaviours are influenced by the culture the people are in. The difference on social media engagement behaviours are even significant between the individualistic cultures and the collectivistic cultures. For example, people in the individualistic cultures more tend to share the contents while people in the collectivistic culture are more likely to like the contents.

The factor of age is also been frequently discussed. For example, because young people nowadays commonly have short attention span, which means they prefer contents which are simple and straight-ward, "less is more" can be a good approach for creating contents which are targeted at young people. (Törőcsik, Szűcs, & Kehl 2014, 30.)

Some claimed the factor which influences social engagement the most is contents. For example, Syrdal (2016, 3) claimed that the focal object of social media engagement is content. It is because there are cases when a person chooses to engage with the company's contents is not because of he or she supports this company but because he or she is just interested in the content.

Botha (2014, 161-164) categorized the factors which have influence on online content sharing into three groups of factors, they are: external factors, intrapersonal factors and interpersonal factors. External factors refers to the characteristics of the content itself. Intrapersonal factors refers to the emotions the content evokes in the audience. The interpersonal factors refers to the social factors. In the whole process of online content sharing, the content itself is where the whole sharing process begins.

To the author's knowledge studies about the relationship between contents and social media engagement mainly focus on these areas: content format, content theme, posting time, content type, content characteristic. In this thesis, the author chose content type and content characteristic to study.

### 2.3.7 Content Types with Social Media Engagement

This part first presents a view of the literature on the categorization of social media content types and then introduces the major findings about how different content types influence social media engagement performance.

- Types of Social Media Contents

Concerning the types of contents on social media, in the research practice, scholars have different ways to categorize the contents in to different types.

By source of the contents, contents on social media are normally categorized into two types, marketer-generated content (MGC) and user-generated contents (UGC). As it can be seen from the name, the first type refers to the contents which are published by the marketers, while the other type of contents are published by the users, or the audiences.

Based on the way how traditional advertising industry categorizes advertisement on social media Lee, Hosanagar, and Nair (2014, 4) claimed MGC can be categorized into two types, informative contents and persuasive contents. They defined the meaning of each type as below:

- Informative contents: They are the contents which are just about product-related information, such as mentioning brand or company name, price-related information, product availability, product location, and specific product. (Lee, et al. 2014, 4.)
- Persuasive contents: They are the contents that attempt to persuade and build relationship with the audience. For example, the contents which are mentioning remarkable fact, presenting emotion or attempting to evoke emotions, mentioning holidays, being humorous or philanthropic, asking questions, and using small talk are all persuasive contents. (Lee, et al. 2014, 4.)

While to the author's knowledge the most popular categorization of social media contents is based on Uses and Gratifications Theory (UGT) and the social media function values which are developed from the UGT theory.

UGT is an "audience-centred theory which focuses on understanding mass communication" (Dahl 2015, 160). It started from traditional media but has been widely used in studies about social media. According to UGT, people are active, self-aware, motive-driven and goal-driven (Dahl 2015, 160).

Based on UGT scholars categorized the values on social media realm into different types. For example, De Vries and Carlson (2014, 25) claimed that there are four types of values on social media, they are: function value, hedonic value, social value and co-creation value.

Based on UGT and the claim of different values on social media, Dolan (2015, 30) proposed that contents on social media can be categorized into four types, they are: informational, entertaining, remunerative and relational. Dolan (2015, 105-112) explained the meaning of each type as below:

- Informational contents: They are the contents with the purpose to deliver information about product, product category and brand. (Dolan 2015, 105-107.)
- Entertaining contents: They are the contents which contain entertaining elements, for example, food, weather, humour, interesting or fun facts, scenic and occasion image, celebrity, animal image, and slang. (Dolan 2015, 107-108.)
- Remunerative contents: They are the contents with monetary related information, like purchase instruction, sales and competition. (Dolan 2015, 108-109.)

- Relational contents: They are the contents which ask questions, quiz, mention holidays and event, have call-to-action and use images which contain people in the images. (Dolan 2015, 109-112.)

- Content Types with Social Media Engagement

The type of content has high influence on social media engagement performance (Cvijikj & Michahelles 2013).

Entertaining contents can always lead to high engagement, including liking, comments and sharing (Cvijikj & Michahelles 2013).

Remunerative contents always lead to low engagement on commenting and liking (Lee et al. 2014, 28-29) or commenting (Stephen et al. 2015, 44). Concerning the reason for remunerative contents' low engagement performance, Stephen et al.(2015, 44) claimed it is because not talking about money is the well accepted norm when people are socializing.

Informational and relational contents can also get high engagement performance on commenting and liking but their engagement performance depends on the characteristics of the contents, which means with certain characteristics, they get high engagement performance while with certain characteristics they get low engagement performance. (Lee et al. 2014.)

### 2.3.8 Content Characteristics with Social Media Engagement

This part at the first presents a view of the literature about the categorization of social media content characteristics and then introduces the major findings about how different content characteristics influence social media engagement performance.

- Characteristics of Social Media Contents

Stephen et al. (2015, 12-17) identified six typical groups of characteristics which might influence content's engagement performance on social media, they are: arousal-oriented, persuasion-oriented, information, call-to-action, references, and media elements. They explained the meaning of each characteristic group as below:

1. Arousal-oriented

It refers to the content's capability to evoke positive response from audience. There are two components for an arousal-oriented content, they are: positivity and being humorous or funny. (Stephen et al. 2015, 12.)

2. Persuasion-oriented

It refers to the content's capability to persuade or influence audience's attitude, opinion or behaviour. There are three components for a persuasion-oriented content, they are: relevance, which means how much the content matches the brand's image; message clarity, which means how clear the message in the content is; and advertising tone, which means how much the content feels like an advertisement. (Stephen et al. 2015, 13)

### 3. Information

It means the content is product-related, brand-related or value-related (Stephen et al. 2015, 15).

### 4. Call-to-Action

It refers to the extent to which the content clearly encourages audience to take specific engagement action, such as "liking" a content, answering a question or leaving a comments in the comments box, or forwarding or opening the link, etc. (Stephen et al. 2015, 16.)

### 5. References

It refers to whether the content refers to other entities or events which are not obviously but somehow related to the brand, for example, mentioning charities or sponsored sport team, or holidays, like Christmas or pseudo- holidays, like International Talk Like A Pirate Day, etc. (Stephen et al. 2015, 16-17).

### 6. Media Elements

It refers to whether the content contains other types of media besides text, for example, image, video, or link (Stephen et al. 2015, 17).

In this thesis the author chose five groups of characteristics to study, they were: arousal-oriented, persuasion-oriented, call-to-action, references, and media elements.

## ● Content Characteristics with Social Media Engagement

Different characteristics of the contents have different influence on social media engagement performance (Lee et al. 2014; Stephen et al. 2015).

To the author's knowledge among the above five characteristic groups the author chose to study in this thesis, two groups of them are usually to be claimed to have high influence on engagement performance on social media, they are: arousal-oriented characteristics and persuasion-oriented characteristics.

First, about arousal-oriented characteristics.

A widely accepted opinion about arousal-oriented characteristics' influence on contents' sharing performance is from Berger and Milkman

(2012, 1) that a content which is no matter positive or negative, as long as is emotional, it will get high amount of sharing. Positive emotions get higher amount of sharing than negative emotions. While among the negative emotions, sadness will get low amount of sharing. But the positive influence of using emotional contents in marketing practice may be reduced in the future due to excessive usage, which will make the audience dulled (Lee et al. 2014, 33).

A content which has complicated emotions also gets high amount of sharing. Because the complicate emotions are like puzzles fro the audience which makes the contents more interesting. (Botha 2014, 55.)

Second, about persuasion-oriented characteristics.

The lower clarity the content is, the more liking, commenting and sharing it gets. It is because the over-elaborated language cause a persuasive image to the content which the audience have been developed to against to. Due to the same reason the lower advertising tone the content has, the more liking, commenting and sharing it gets. Relevant contents get high engagement performance while non relevant contents only get consumed, and the more relevant the content is, the more engagement it gets. (Stephen et al. 2015, 37-43.)

For call-to-action, the engagement performance depends. Whether call-to-action can get high engagement or not depends on each of the specific social media platform. Because some platforms have labelled the content which has call-to-action in it as misleading and adjusted their algorithm to give lower weight to call-to-action. (Peruta & Shields 2018.)

Stephen et al. (2015, 47) claimed that lots of marketers think having rich media elements in the contents can improve the contents' engagement performance, they even spend lots of resources to create image or videos for their contents. But actually it will not affect the engagement of the contents, even not the high quality images or videos, and sometimes it will even has negative influence.

While for reference, Stephen et al. (2015, 17) claimed that according to traditional marketing concept, having references in the contents gives the contents the chance to piggyback on others. But companies need to be conservative about the effect of using reference in the contents because it may dilute the message in the contents and then gets the audience confused and leads to low social media engagement.

## 2.4 Summary of the Literature

This chapter reviewed the relevant literature regarding two marketing strategies, content marketing and social media marketing with the focus

of social media engagement . At the same time it presented what is the good content from these two different perspectives.

It can be seen that from content marking' point of view, though definitions of good contents from practitioners' side and scholars' side are not totally aligned, some characteristics have been recognized from both sides, they are: value, emotional and relevant. While in terms of the influence on social media engagement, the definition of a good content is more specific, they are: entertaining, emotional, relevant, low advertising tone, and without media elements.

The literature has been widely used for studies of the relationship between contents and social media engagement. But at the same time, it is not sufficient for the special case of foreign universities' social media engagement on Sina Weibo. Thus, the author conducted a empirical research to investigate. In the next chapter, research of the case study will be presented.

### 3 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Last chapter viewed the relevant literature for the research. This chapter presents the empirical research, a case study the author conducted for this thesis.

This chapter starts with a brief introduction of the methodology adopted in the empirical research which was a case study, and then presents the process of the case study which was based on the method of content analysis.

#### 3.1 Methodology

Besides the desk research of viewing the relevant literature, in this thesis, the author also conducted an empirical research, which was a case study.

A case study research paper examines a person, place, event, phenomenon, or other type of subject of analysis in order to extrapolate key themes and results that help predict future trends, illuminate previously hidden issues that can be applied to practice, and/or provide a means for understanding an important research problem with greater clarity. (University of Southern California 2018.)

In this thesis, five foreign universities were chosen for the case study. One was the commissioning university, the others were four foreign universities which were having good social media engagement performance on Sina Weibo. One of them was from the United States (US), one was from the United Kingdom (UK) and the other two were from Finland.

For the other four universities, the research studied certain amount of contents published by the universities. For the commissioning university, the research studied the contents published by the commissioning university in an experiment session which was carried out for this research's purpose.

In the experiment, total 20 contents were published during a period from 13<sup>th</sup> July 2018 to 14<sup>th</sup> Aug 2018. As of 18<sup>th</sup> Aug 2018 there were 347 followers, three followers more than before the experiment. As of 18<sup>th</sup> Aug 2018, for all the 20 contents, none of them got sharing. Three contents got commenting and 15 contents got liking.

#### 3.2 Content Analysis

The study of the contents from all the five case universities was based on the method of content analysis.



Content analysis is a systematic analysis of text. The essential part of a content analysis is classification of parts of the text by coding scheme. It contains two types of analysis, quantitative and qualitative and content analysis contains these key steps, research question, variable, coding scheme and sampling and coding. (Rose, Spinks, & Canhoto 2015, 1.)

In this thesis, the qualitative type of content analysis was adopted. The case study process is presented by following the key steps of content analysis.

### 3.2.1 Data Collection

Data collection in this thesis was carried out in two steps. First, the author collected raw data from the five case universities and then the author picked the sample contents from the raw data for further analysis.

- Raw Data Collection

The raw data collection for Yale University and University of Cambridge was carried out on 4<sup>th</sup> Jun 2018 and for University of Oulu and Oulu University of Applied Sciences it was on 9<sup>th</sup> Jun 2018. The raw data from the experiment for the commissioning university was collected on 18<sup>th</sup> Aug 2018.

The raw data collection was carried out in three steps. In the first step, the author chose the suitable case universities and divided them into three groups. In the second step, the author got a total of 412 contents from the five case universities. In the third step, the author got the engagement performance of sharing, commenting and liking for each of the 412 contents.

#### **Step 1: getting suitable case universities**

In order to get the suitable case universities besides the commissioning university the author used the ranking list from Sina Weibo as the only reference.

First, in the searching process, the author used the Chinese word of “大学” which means university in “search account” option on Sina Weibo and got a ranking list of all the universities on Sina Weibo. Then the author chose the top two foreign universities from the list. They were: Yale University from US and University of Cambridge from UK. Searching by using the Chinese word of “芬兰 大学” which means Finnish university the author got the top two universities from Finland, they were: University of Oulu and Oulu University of Applied Sciences.

The author found that Yale University had 647,090 followers, University of Cambridge had 107,212 followers. University of Oulu had 2,374 followers while Oulu University of Applied Sciences had 1,453 followers. It seemed that the first two universities had much more followers than the later two universities. Taking consideration of the case company for this thesis is HAMK which is from Finland the author decided to separate these four universities into two groups. Group A contained Yale University and University of Cambridge while Group B contained University of Oulu and Oulu University of Applied Sciences. The commissioning university was named as Group C.

### **Step 2: getting suitable contents**

For the experiment for the commissioning university the raw data contained the whole 20 contents posted on Sina Weibo during the period from 13<sup>th</sup> July to 14<sup>th</sup> Aug 2018.

For the other four case universities, in order to get the suitable contents, the author set a time frame of 1<sup>st</sup> Jun 2018. The author only collected the contents which were published before this date. It was because on one hand, there was a 4 to 9 days period after the contents were published, so the audience probably already had enough time to respond to the contents. On the other hand, the author believed that after 4 to 9 days since the contents got published, it was very likely the contents already got stabilized, which means there might be update on some of these contents, but the chance of having dramatic update might not be big.

Then by going backwards from the publishing date of 1<sup>st</sup> Jun 2018, the author collected totally 412 contents. They were: each 100 contents from Yale University, University of Cambridge and University of Oulu, and 92 contents from Oulu University of Applied Sciences since till 9<sup>th</sup> Jun 2018 this university did not have enough contents. The author named these 412 contents as the content pool.

### **Step 3: getting engagement performance for each content**

Because of the same reason of possible engagement update, the engagement performance data the author used was the data retrieved on 4<sup>th</sup> Jun 2018 for Yale University and University of Cambridge and on 9<sup>th</sup> Jun 2018 for University of Oulu and Oulu University of Applied Sciences, and on 18<sup>th</sup> of Aug 2018 for the commissioning university.

After the raw data collection, the author got the engagement performance of sharing, commenting and liking for total 412 contents from five case universities. Details can be seen in Appendix 1 Content Pool of Group A, Appendix 2 Content Pool of Group B and Appendix 3 Content Pool of Group C. The raw data collection result is summarized in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Summary of Raw Data Collection

Case Study Group	University	Amount of Content	Total Amount of Content	Engagement	Performance Range
A	Yale Cambridge	100 100	200	Sharing	0-119
				Commenting	0-54
				Liking	10-524
B	Oulu OAMK	100 92	192	Sharing	0-7
				Commenting	0-26
				Liking	0-16
C	HAMK	20	20	Sharing	0
				Commenting	0-8
				Liking	0-4
<b>Total</b>			<b>412</b>		

- Sample Data Collection

Then the author collected the samples from the raw data for the study of each engagement. The sample collection process contained three steps. In the first step, the author categorized the contents in each content pool into different levels based on the contents' engagement performance. In the second step, the author chose the suitable levels. In the last step, among the contents with performance on the suitable level, the author decided the which contents which will be used as samples.

### Step 1: categorizing engagement performance into different levels

The author assumed that normally on social media, for a group of contents their engagement performance can be categorized into three levels, good, bad and average. Good performance means higher amount of sharing, or commenting or liking, bad engagement performance means lower amount of sharing, commenting or liking, while average performance means average amount of sharing, commenting or liking.

While in this thesis, the author found that there were two exceptions. For engagement of sharing, there were three levels in Group A, two levels in Group B and one level in Group C. Because in Group B, the amount of contents which did not get any sharing took 70% of the total contents in the pool and in Group C, the amount of contents which did not get any sharing took 100% of the total contents in the pool. So for Group B and Group C, no sharing was the average performance, while getting some sharing or commenting was good performance.

While for engagement of commenting, there were three levels in Group A, two levels in Group B and Group C. In Group B, the amount of contents which did not get any commenting took 64% of the total content in the

pool and in Group C, the total amount of contents which did not get any comment took 85% of the total contents in the pool. So for Group B and Group C, no commenting was the average performance, while getting some commenting was good performance.

### **Step 2: choosing the suitable performance level**

The performance level from where the author collected samples was based on the research questions, which are:

Question 1: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content types had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

Question 2: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content characteristics had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

Based on the questions, the sample contents should contain contents with good performance and contents with bad performance.

For engagement of sharing and commenting, in Group A, there were contents with good performance and also contents with bad performance which were contents belonged to Level Good and contents belonged to Level Bad. While in Group B and Group C, there were contents with good performance and contents with average performance, but no contents with bad performance. So the author chose the contents belonged to Level Good and the contents belonged to Level Bad from Group A as sample contents, but no contents from Group B. In Group C, the author noticed among the contents in Level Good, some had higher amount of commenting while some had lower amount, so all the contents belonged to Level Good were used as sample contents.

For engagement of liking, in both Group A and Group B, there were contents with good performance and also contents with bad performance which were the contents belonged to Level Good and contents belonged to Level Bad. So the author chose the contents belonged to level Good and the contents belonged to level Bad from each group as sample contents. In Group C, the author noticed that though it was hard to categorize the performance into different levels, but there were difference in the contents' liking performance, so all the contents in the pool were used as sample contents.

### **Step 3: choosing the contents for sample contents**

In Group A, for each engagement, in order to get typical sample contents, the author chose 10 contents with the best performance from Level Good and 10 contents with the worst performance from Level Bad as samples .

In Group B, for engagement of liking, the author chose 10 contents with the best performance from Level Good and 10 contents with the worst performance from Level Bad as samples.

In Group C, all three contents in Level were chosen as samples for study of commenting while all 20 contents in the content pool were chosen for study of liking.

The sample collection result is summarized in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Summary of Sample Collection

Case Study Group	University	Engagement	Performance Level in Content Pool	Amount of Sample Content	Performance Range
A	Yale Cambridge	Sharing	Level Good	10	37-119
			Level Bad	10	0-1
		Commenting	Level Good	10	20-54
			Level Bad	10	0
		Liking	Level Good	10	168-524
			Level Bad	10	10-16
B	Oulu OAMK	Liking	Level Good	10	11-16
			Level Bad	10	0-1
C	HAMK	Commenting	Level Good	3	1, 6, 8
		Liking	All	20	0-4

Since in Group A and Group B there were certain contents were collected as samples for more than one study, in Group A there were total 46 different sample contents, and in Group B, there were total 20 different samples, while in Group C, all the contents in the pool were used as sample contents. So for the whole case study there were total 86 different sample contents. The sample contents amount details for the case study were presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Sample Contents for Case Study

Engagement	Case Study Group	Amount of Sample Content
Sharing, Commenting & Liking	A	46
	B	20
	C	20
<b>Total</b>		<b>86</b>

### 3.2.2 Data Analysis

#### 3.1.3.1 Variables, Coding Scheme and Coding Results

- Variables

In order to more deeply investigate how each content type and characteristic influenced the social media engagement of the contents, based on the guidelines in the literature the author set up 10 categories of variables. They contained four variables about content types and 24 variables about content characteristic. The categories and variables are summarized in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Categories and Variables

S/N	Category	Variable
1	Type	Informational
2		Entertaining
3		Remunerative
4		Relational
5	Positivity	High Positive
6		Medium Positive
7		Low Positive
8		Negative
9		Complicate
10	Humorous/Funny	Being Humorous/Funny
11		Not Humorous/Funny
12	Relevance	High Relevant
13		Medium Relevant
14		Low Relevant
15		Non Relevant
16	Advertising Tone	High Advertising Tone
17		Medium Advertising Tone
18		Low Advertising Tone
19	Call-to-Action	With Call-to-Action
20		Without Call-to-Action
21	Reference	With Reference
22		Without Reference
23	Link	With Link
24		Without Link
25	Image	With Image
26		Without Image
27	Video	With Video
28		Without Video

- Coding Scheme

Coding scheme is “the process of developing classification rules to assign coding units to particular categories or concepts” (Rose, Spinks, & Canhoto 2015, 1).

For the 28 variables, the author created the description to define each of them.

### **Content Type Variables**

There were four variables about content type. They are summarised in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5 Content Type Variables

<b>Content Type Variable</b>	
Informational	Entertaining
Remunerative	Relational

**Informational:** In this thesis, the author defined informational content as the content which had brand-related or product-related information in the contents. The description of informational content is presented in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6 Variable 1 Informational Content

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Informational Content</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>1</b>	Brand-related information	university information, university library, university event, university news, university staff's news, campus image/video
<b>2</b>	Product-related information	programme or programme-related information, application/admission information

**Entertaining:** In this thesis, the author defined entertaining content as the content which was supposed to provide information with the purpose of entertaining the audience. The description of entertaining content is presented in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7 Variable 2 Entertaining Content

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Entertaining Content</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>1</b>	Hot Topics	hot topics
<b>2</b>	Famous person	famous person
<b>3</b>	Humor or jokes	humor or joke
<b>4</b>	Animals	images contains animals
<b>5</b>	Others for entertaining purpose	not university/programme related image or video

**Remunerative:** In this theses, the author defined relational content as the content which had monetary information, like discount or lottery in

the content. The description of remunerative content is presented in Table 3.8.

Table 3.8 Variable 3 Remunerative Content

S/N	Remunerative Content	Description
1	Monetary information	discount, lottery, student-price

**Relational:** In this thesis, the author defined relational content as the content which was asking questions, mentioning holidays or special days, giving wishes or congrats to others, having images of student, or providing notice. The description of relational content is presented in Table 3.9

Table 3.9 Variable 4 Relational Content

S/N	Relational Content	Description
1	Special day/holiday	today-in-history; mid-summer day, first winter day, holiday-related wishes or questions, Monday
2	Questions/ questionnaires	non- monetary related questions
3	Congrats	congrats to student or other entities
4	Student	image/article/video about student
5	Notice	non university or programme related notice

### **Content Characteristic Variables**

There were nine categories of characteristic variables. They are summarised in Table 3.10.

Table 3.10 Content Characteristic Categories

Content Characteristic Category		
Positivity	Humorous/Funny	Relevance
Advertising Tone	Call-to-Action	Reference
Link	Image	Video

**Positivity:** The author set up five different levels of positivity, high, medium, low, negative and complicate.

The author created two parameters to define each level. One was the message in the content, the other was the tone of the content, for example, wording or using emoticon.

So high positive content was the content which was positive both in message and in tone; medium positive content was the content which was only positive in message or in tone; low positive content was the content which was not positive in message or tone; negative content was the content which was negative both in message and tone, and complicate content was the content which had both positive and



negative in the content. The description of the five variables about positivity is presented in Table 3.11.

Table 3.11 Variable 5-9 Positivity

Positivity		
Variable	Description	
	Message	Tone
High Positive	Positive	Positive
Medium Positive	Positive	Positive
	Positive	Positive
Low Positive	not positive	Positive
Negative	Negative	Negative
Complicate	Positive	Negative
	Negative	Positive

**Humorous/Funny:** The author adopted the two parameters, message and tone of the content from defining the variables of positivity to define the two variables about humorous/funny. Humorous/funny content was the content which was humorous /funny in message, while the content which was not humorous/funny was the content which was not humorous/funny in the message. The description of the two variables about humorous/funny is presented in Table 3.12.

Table 3.12 Variable 10-11 Humorous/Funny

Humorous/Funny		
Variable	Description	
	Message	Tone
Being Humorous/Funny	humorous/funny	humorous/funny
	humorous/funny	Not Humorous/Funny
Not Humorous/Funny	not humorous/funny	humorous/funny
	not humorous/funny	not humorous/funny

**Relevance:** The parameter the author used to define relevance was the relevance between the main point of content and the university or its programme. By using this parameter the author created four different levels of relevance, high, medium, low and no relevance.

High relevant content was the content which was mainly about the university or its programme; medium relevant content was the content which was mainly about the university's students or its staff, and at the same time the activities they did as described in the content were related with the university or its programme; low relevant content referred to two types of content, one was the content which was mainly about something not related with university or not its programme, or someone else, not university staff or university's student but the content was somehow related with the university or its programme; the other type was the content which was mainly about university, its faculty or

students but the activities they did as described in the contents were not related with university or its programme. Non relevance referred to the content which had nothing to do with university, its programme, or student or staff at all. The description of the four variables about relevance is presented in Table 3.13.

Table 3.13 Variable 12-15 Relevance

Relevance		
Variable	Description	
	Subject	Activity
High Relevant	about university or its programme	
Medium Relevant	university's student or staff	about university or its programme
Low Relevant	not related with university/its programme/university's student university's staff	about university or its programme
	university/university's student/university's staff	not related with university or its programme
Non Relevant	not related with university/its programme/university's student university's staff	not related with university or its programme

**Advertising Tone:** The author set up three different levels based on how much advertising feeling the tone of the content was. High adverting tone referred to the content which obviously complimented the university or its programme, or using obvious adverting words; medium advertising tone referred to the content which was complimenting something else instead of the university or its programme but somehow related to one of them, or the content plainly described the university or its programme and low advertising tone referred to the content which was not belonging to either of the above levels. The description of the three variables about advertising tone is presented in Table 3.14.

Table 3.14 Variable 16-18 Advertising Tone

Advertising Tone	
Variable	Description
High Advertising Tone	obviously complement university or its programme or using advertising word
Medium Advertising Tone	complement something/some one indirectly related with university or its programme
	plainly state university or its programme
Low Advertising Tone	not belong to any above

**Call-to-Action:** The author defined call-to-action as clearly asking audience to take actions. Based on this, there were two variables under this category. The description of the two variables about call-to-action is presented in Table 3.15.

Table 3.15 Variable 19-20 Call-to-Action

Call-to-Action	
Variable	Description
With Call-to-Action	ask audience to take action
Without Call-to-Action	not ask audience to take action

**Reference:** The author defined reference as mentioning special days or hot topics in the content. The description of the two variables about reference is presented in Table 3.16.

Table 3.16 Variable 21-22 Reference

Reference	
Variable	Description
With Reference	mention special day or hot topic
Without Reference	not mention special day or hot topic

**Link/Image/Video:** The author created two variables under each of these categories. The description of the six variables about media elements is presented in Table 3.17.

Table 3.17 Variable 23-28 Link/Image/Video

Link/Image/Video	
Variable	Description
With Link/Image/Video	have link/image/video
Without Link/Image/Video	not have link/image/video

The code book is presented in Table 3.18. After created the code book, the author did the coding by herself by using the tool of excel.

- Coding Results

After coding, the author got the coding results, which are presented in Appendix 4 Coding Result for Study of Sharing, Appendix 5 Coding Result for Study of Commenting, and Appendix 6 Coding Result for Study of Liking.

The coding results showed that among all the 86 sample contents of the case study of five case universities, all the 28 variables were coded. But for each case university groups, there were certain variables were not coded.

For Group A, there were two variables, Remunerative and Complicate were not coded. For Group B there were three variables were not coded,

they were: Negative, Complicate and Being Humorous/Funny. For Group C, there was one variable, Negative was not coded.

Table 3.18 Code Book

S/N	Category	Variable	Coded as
1	Type	Informational	H
2		Entertaining	E
3		Remunerative	R
4		Relational	R
5	Positivity	High Positive	H
6		Medium Positive	M
7		Low Positive	L
8		Negative	N
9		Complicate	C
10	Humorous/Funny	Being Humorous/Funny	Y
11		Not Humorous/Funny	N
12	Relevance	High Relevant	H
13		Medium Relevant	M
14		Low Relevant	L
15		Non Relevant	N
16	Advertising Tone	High Advertising Tone	H
17		Medium Advertising Tone	M
18		Low Advertising Tone	L
19	Call-to-Action	With Call-to-Action	Y
20		Without Call-to-Action	N
21	Reference	With Reference	Y
22		Without Reference	N
23	Link	With Link	Y
24		Without Link	N
25	Image	With Image	Y
26		Without Image	N
27	Video	With Video	Y
28		Without Video	N

### 3.1.3.2 Method for Analysing Coding Results

The method for analyzing the coding results was based on the two subquestions, which are:

Question 1: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content types had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

Question 2: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content characteristics had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

In order to answer these two questions, first the author identified the types and characteristics which had a higher influence on engagement performance of the contents, then the author identified which of them had a higher positive or negative influence.

Since the sample contents were collected in different ways in the other case universities and in the commissioning university, the detailed methods for analysing the code results were different as well.

### **In the Four Case Universities**

Since the sample collection methods for all three studies were the same, the methods for analysing the coding results for three studies were the same as well.

#### **Step 1: identifying variables that had a higher Influence**

By observing the variables in the coding results the author found that there were two types of variables in the sample contents for each study.

One type of variables were coded in the contents belonged to Level Good and also in the contents belonged to Level Bad. While the other type of variables were coded only in the contents belonged to Level Good or only in the contents belonged to Level Bad.

It means the first type of variables worked with other factors to decide the performance of the contents, to end up in Level Good or in Level Bad. While for the second type of variables, they had possibility to decide the performance of the contents to end up in Level Good or in Level Bad by the influence of themselves, without working with other factors.

So in this sense, the second type of variables had a higher influence on engagement performance of the contents.

#### **Step 2: identifying variables that had a higher positive or negative influence**

By observing the variables in the coding results the author found that there were two types of variables for the for the variables which had a higher influence.

One type of variables were coded only in the contents belonged to Level Good while the other type of variables were coded only in the contents belonged to Level Bad.

It means, the first type of variables had possibility to decide the performance of the contents to end up in Level Good. While for the

second type of variables, they had possibility to decide the performance of the contents to end up in Level Bad.

So in this sense, the first type of variables had a higher positive influence, while the second type of variables had a higher negative influence.

So the types or characteristics which had a higher positive influence on engagement performance for the contents were the variables which were only coded in the contents belonged to Level Good, while the types or characteristics which had a higher negative influence on engagement performance for the contents were the variables which were only coded in the contents belonged to Level Bad.

### **In the Commissioning University**

Because in the experiment no sample contents got sharing, the author only studied commenting and liking performance for each question. Since the sample collection methods for study of commenting and liking were different, the methods for analysing the coding results were different as well.

#### **Step 1: indentifying variables that had a higher influence**

By observing the variables in the coding results the author found that there were two types of variables in the sample contents for each study.

As for commenting, from the coding results the author found that one type of variables were coded in the contents with the highest commenting and were also coded in the contents with the lowest commenting. While the other type of variables were coded in the contents which were not with two extreme performances.

It means, the first type of variables had to work with other factors to decide the performance of the contents, to avoid the highest or the lowest performance. While for the second type of variables, they had possibility to decide the performance of the contents, to avoid the highest or the lowest performance by the influence of themselves, without working with other factors.

As for liking, first, the author got the average performance of all the contents. The total amount of liking was 23, the total content amount was 20. So the average liking performance was 1 ( $23/20=1$ ). Then, the author found one type of variables were coded in the contents with average performance of 1, the other type of variables were coded in the contents with performance higher or lower than 1.

It means, the first type of variables had to work with other factors to avoid to get the contents average performance. While for the second

type of variables, they had possibility to decide the performance of the contents, to avoid average performance by the influence of themselves, without working with other factors.

So in this sense, the second type of variables had a higher influence to influence engagement performance of the contents.

### **Step 2: indentifying variables that had a higher positive or negative influence**

By observing the variables in the coding results the author found that there were two types of variables for the variables which had a higher influence in each study.

As for commenting, one type of variables were coded in the contents with higher amount of commenting while the other type of variables were coded in the contents with lower amount of commenting.

It means, the first type of variables had possibility to get the contents higher amount of commenting. While the second type of variables had possibility to get the contents lower amount of commenting.

As for liking, one type of variables were only coded in the contents with average performance higher than 1 while the other type of variables were only coded in the contents with average performance lower than 1.

It means, the first type of variables had possibility to decide the performance of the contents to be higher than average. While the second type of variables had possibility to decide the performance of the contents to be lower than average.

So in this sense, the first type of variables had a higher positive influence, while the second type of variables had a higher negative influence.

So concerning commenting, the types or characteristics which had a higher positive influence were the variables which were only coded in the contents with higher amount of commenting, while the types or characteristics which had a higher negative influence were the variables which were only coded in the contents with lower amount of commenting.

Concerning liking, the types or characteristics which had a higher positive influence were the variables which were only coded in the contents with performance higher than 1, while the types or characteristics which had a higher negative influence were the variables which were only coded in the contents with performance lower than 1.

## 4 FINDINGS

### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the whole case study.

First it presents the findings in the four case universities, then it presents the findings in the experiment for the commissioning university, at the end it sums up the findings by putting the findings of all five case universities together.

#### 4.1.1 Findings in the Four Case Universities

From Appendix 4 Coding Result for Study of Sharing, the author found that four variables had a higher positive influence, they were: Entertaining, Being Humorous/Funny, High Relevant and With Video. One variables had a higher negative influence, it was: Non Relevant.

From Appendix 5 Coding Result for Study of Commenting, it can be seen that three variables had a higher positive influence, they were: Being Humorous/Funny, Non Relevant, and With Call-to-Action, and three variables had a higher negative influence, they were: High Advertising Tone, With Link, and With Video.

From Appendix 6 Coding Result for Study of Liking, it can be seen that in Group A, two variables had a higher positive influence, they were: Entertaining and High Relevant and six variables had a higher negative influence, they were: Non Relevant, High Advertising Tone, With Call-to-Action, With Link, Without Image and With Video. In Group B, three variables had a higher positive influence, they were: Entertaining, Without Image, and With Video. Three variables had a higher negative influence, they were: Remunerative, Low Relevant, and High Advertising Tone.

By putting the findings of these three studies together, it can be seen that among total 27 coded variables, 11 variables had a higher positive or negative influence at least on one engagement.

The findings are presented in Table 4.1. P refers to positive, N refers to negative. Influence in bold for engagement of liking means the type and characteristic had the same influence in both case university Group A and Group B.

Based on the above findings, the author got the answer for each supporting question:



Answer 1: For the social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, the type of entertaining had a higher positive influence while the type of remunerative had a higher negative influence. For engagement of sharing, the type of entertaining had a higher positive influence and there was no type had a higher negative influence.

Answer 2: For the social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, two characteristics, being humorous/funny and high relevant had a higher positive influence while three characteristics, low relevant, high advertising tone, and with link had a higher negative influence. For engagement of sharing, three characteristics, being humorous/funny, high relevant, and with video had a higher positive influence while one characteristic, non relevant had a higher negative influence.

Four characteristics had different influence on different engagement or in different groups. Among them, non relevant had a higher positive influence on commenting but had a higher negative influence on sharing and liking. With call-to-action had a higher positive influence on commenting but had a higher negative influence on liking. Without image had a higher positive influence on liking in Group A but had a higher negative influence in Group B. With video had a higher positive influence on sharing and liking in Group A but had a higher negative influence commenting in Group A and liking in Group B.

Table 4.1 Higher-Influence Types/Characteristics – Four Case Universities

S/N	Type/Characteristic	Sharing (Group A)	Commenting (Group A)	Liking (Group A/B)
1	Entertaining	P		P
2	Remunerative			N
3	Being Humorous/Funny	P	P	
4	High Relevant	P		P
5	Low Relevant			N
6	Non Relevant	N	P	N
7	High Advertising Tone		N	N
8	With Call-to-Action		P	N
9	With Link		N	N
10	Without Image			P/N
11	With Video	P	N	P/N

#### 4.1.2 Findings in the Commissioning University

From Appendix 5 Coding Result for Study of Commenting, the author found that three variables had a higher positive influence, they were: Being Humorous/Funny, Low Advertising Tone, and With Call-to-Action. Three variables had a higher negative influence, they were: Not Humorous/Funny, Medium Advertising Tone, and Without Call-to-Action.

From Appendix 6 Coding Result for Study of Liking, it can be seen that two variables had a higher positive influence, they were: Complicate and Medium Relevant. Three variables had a higher negative influence, they were: Informational, High Relevant and With Video.

By putting the findings of these two studies together, it can be seen that among total 27 coded variables, 11 variables had a higher positive or a negative influence at least on one engagement.

The findings are presented in Table 4.2. P refers to positive, N refers to negative.

Table 4.2 Higher-Influence Types/Characteristics – Commissioning University

S/N	Type/Characteristic	Commenting (Group C)	Liking (Group C)
1	Informational		N
2	Complicate		P
3	Being Humorous/Funny	P	
4	Not Humorous/Funny	N	
5	High Relevant		N
6	Medium Relevant		P
7	Medium Advertising Tone	N	
8	Low Advertising Tone	P	
9	With Call-to-Action	P	
10	Without Call-to-Action	N	
11	With Video		N

Based on the above findings, the author got the answer for each supporting question:

Answer 1: For the social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, no type had a higher positive influence while the type of informational had a higher negative influence.

Answer 2: For the social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, five characteristics, complicate emotion, being humorous/funny, medium relevant, low advertising tone, and with call-to-action had a higher positive influence while five characteristics, not humorous/funny, high relevant, medium advertising tone, without call-to-action, and with video had a higher negative influence.

#### 4.2 Summary of Findings

This chapter presents the findings of the whole case study for each supporting research question.

Question 1: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content types had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

Answer 1: For the social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, the type of entertaining had a higher positive influence while the types of informational and remunerative had a higher negative influence. For engagement of sharing, the type of entertaining had a higher positive influence and there was no type had a higher negative influence.

Question 2: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content characteristics had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

Answer 2: For the social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, four characteristics, complicate emotion, being humorous/funny, medium relevant, and low advertising tone had a higher positive influence while six characteristics, not humorous/funny, low relevant, high advertising tone, medium advertising tone, without call-to-action, and with link had a higher negative influence.

Five characteristics had different influence on different engagement or in different groups. Among them, high relevant had a higher positive on sharing and liking in Group A but had higher negative influence on liking in the experiment for the commissioning university. Non relevant had a higher positive influence on commenting but had a higher negative influence on sharing and liking. With call-to-action had a higher positive influence on commenting but had a higher negative influence on liking. Without image had a higher positive influence on liking in Group A but had a higher negative influence in Group B. With video had a higher positive influence on sharing and liking in Group A but had a higher negative influence commenting in Group A and liking in Group B.

The findings are presented in Table 4.3. P refers to positive, N refers to negative. Influence written in capital letters represents the influence in the case study of Group A or Group B; influence written in small letters means the influence in the experiment for the commissioning university. Influence in bold for liking means the type and characteristic had the same influence in both Group A and Group B; influence with underline means the influence was the same in Group C.

Table 4.3 Higher-Influence Types/Characteristics – Whole Case Study

S/N	Type/Characteristic	Sharing (Group A)	Commenting (Group A)	Liking (Group A/B/C)
1	Informational			n
2	Entertaining	P		P
3	Remunerative			N
4	Complicate			p
5	Being Humorous/Funny	P	<u>p</u>	
6	Not Humorous/Funny		n	
7	High Relevant	P		P/n
8	Medium Relevant			p
9	Low Relevant			N
10	Non Relevant	N	P	N
11	High Advertising Tone		N	<b>N</b>
12	Medium Advertising Tone		n	
13	Low Advertising Tone		p	
14	With Call-to-Action		<u>p</u>	N
15	Without Call-to-Action		n	
16	With Link		N	N
17	Without Image			P/N
18	With Video	P	N	<u>P/N</u>

## 5 DISCUSSION

This chapter addresses the main outcomes of this thesis. First it examines the case study findings by comparing with literature, then it presents the contributions and managerial implications for the commissioning university, at the end it describes the study limitations and then suggests directions for future study.

### 5.1 Examinations of Research Findings

The main purpose of this thesis was to find out for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, how content types and characteristics influenced social media engagement, especially the engagement of sharing. Therefore, HAMK can utilize this research result to improve its social media engagement performance on Sina Weibo in the future. In this part, the author examines the findings by comparing with literature for each subquestion.

#### 5.1.1 Examination of Findings for Subquestion 1

Question 1: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content types had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

The findings showed among total four content types, one type had a higher positive influence while two types had a higher negative influence.

The finding of entertaining contents' positive influence is consistent with previous finding that entertaining contents always get high engagement (Cvijikj & Michahelles 2013). The finding of the negative influence of remunerative contents is consistent with previous findings that remunerative contents get low engagement (Lee et al. 2014 28-29; Stephen et al. 2015, 44).

As for the negative influence of informational contents which was found in the experiment for the commissioning university, the author found all of these informational contents were posted at the beginning of the experiment. While in the later stage of the experiment, all the new contents got higher engagement performance. Based on the findings, the author interprets the reason could be these informational contents were posted at the wrong time. So the author believes that in most cases, for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, the situation probably was as similar as the finding of the other four universities, that is informational contents had a lower influence on content's engagement performance which is consistent with the finding from Lee et al. (2014).

At the same time, the findings confirm previous finding that relational contents have a lower influence, which means just being relational can not decide the engagement performance of the contents on social media (Lee et al. 2014).

- For Sharing

The finding of the higher positive influence of entertaining contents on sharing is not surprising. It is because comparing with people of other age groups, the audience in the case study were mainly young people who normally are more fond of entertainment. At the same time entertaining contents triggered happy emotions which is one of the emotions the young people normally like to spread online. So entertaining contents were meaning social currency and emotion for the audience. According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed social currency and emotion drive sharing.

The finding of the lower influence of relational contents is not surprising either. It is because in the research relational contents contained several different kinds of contents, which were: mentioning special days or holidays, congratulations to others, mentioning students, providing notice, and asking questions. Mentioning holidays or special days and congratulations to others meant public; mentioning student meant story; notice meant social currency and practical value, while asking questions did not have direct relationship with any of the elements in Berger's STEPPS principle. So it was predictable that some of the relational contents got higher amount of sharing while some got lower amount of sharing, and being relational had a lower influence on sharing.

While among all these relational contents, it showed that except one content which was about congratulations to others (Beijing University's 100 year birthday) all the other contents got low engagement on sharing. Among the other relational contents the content which was also about congratulations to others (student winning prize) had low engagement on sharing. It indicates that among these elements, public, story, social currency and practical value, public might have more weight.

The finding of the lower influence of the other two content types is surprising. Remunerative contents were providing monetary information, informational contents were providing university-related or programme-related information, both types of information had social currency or also practical value. According to Berger's STEPPS principle, they were supposed to get higher amount of sharing. But the findings showed some of them they got higher amount of sharing while some got lower amount of sharing. It means audience only shared contents which had enough social currency or enough practical value. By comparing with the entertaining contents which had social currency and emotion only got higher amount of sharing, it can be seen that emotion might have more

weigh than social currency and practical value. It confirms the importance of emotion in content marketing (Pažėraitė & Repovienė 2016, 105) and in the process of content sharing (Berger & Milkman 2012, 1).

An interesting finding is that remunerative content had a lower influence on sharing. It means the audience decided to share a content or not was not because there was monetary information in it or not. Stephen et al. (2015, 44) claimed that talking about money is the well accepted norm when people are socializing, so remunerative contents get low engagement on commenting. But the findings indicate in the case study the audience did not follow the norm. This finding confirms that culture is one of the factors influencing social media engagement (Chwialkowska 2017, 163).

### 5.1.2 Examination of Findings for Subquestion 2

Question 2: For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, which content characteristics had a higher positive or negative influence on social media engagement, especially on the engagement of sharing?

The findings showed some characteristics had a higher positive influence while some characteristics had a higher negative influence. The author examines these characteristics by following the groups they belong to.

#### 1. Arousal-oriented

The findings showed contents having complicate emotion got higher engagement performance on liking. This finding is somehow consistent with the finding of Botha (2014, 55) that contents having complicate emotions get more sharing. But since this finding was only in the experiment for the commissioning university with very limited amount of sample contents, the author believes it needs further studies to confirm complicate emotion's influence on engagement performance for foreign universities on Sina Weibo.

The finding of the positive influence of being humorous/funny is consistent with the previous findings that being emotional has positive influence from content marketing' point of view (Pažėraitė & Repovienė 2016, 105) and content sharing's point of view (Berger & Milkman 2012, 1).

Concerning the negative influence of not humorous/funny on commenting which was found in the experiment for the commissioning university, due to the very limited amount of sample contents, it is hard to say not humorous/funny had negative influence on commenting for foreign universities on Sina Weibo.

## 2. Persuasion-oriented

The finding of the negative influence of high advertising tone is consistent with Stephen et al. (2015, 37-43) that people have developed to against the persuasive image in the contents. But concerning the negative influence of medium advertising tone and positive influence of low advertising tone which were found in the experiment for the commissioning university, due to same reason of the very limited amount of sample contents, it is hard to say what was their influence on social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo.

Another unsurprising finding was the positive influence of high and medium relevant and the negative influence of low relevant and non relevant. It is consistent with previous findings about the importance of relevance from content marking's point (Content Marketing Institute n.d.) and also from social media engagement's point of view (Stephen et al. 2015, 37-43). But concerning the positive influence of medium relevant which was found in the experiment for the commissioning university, due to same reason of the very limited amount of sample contents, it is hard to say what was its influence on social media engagement for foreign universities on Sina Weibo.

But the findings also showed two exceptional cases. One was high relevant had negative influence in the experiment for the commissioning university. After checking these high relevant contents in the coding result the author found that like all the informational contents, all of these high relevant contents were also posted at the beginning of the experiment. The author interprets the reason might be the same, that is these contents got low engagement performance was not because of being high relevant, but probably because of the timing was not right. So the author believes that in most cases, for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, the situation probably was as similar as the finding about the other four universities, that is high relevant had positive influence on content's engagement performance.

The other exceptional case was non relevant had positive influence on commenting. According to previous studies, key motives for commenting are to be in touch with other online connections who have mentioned the contents or to acquire more product information (Chwialkowska 2017, 132). After checking these contents in the coding results the author found they were coded in the contents which were asking questions or providing remunerative or other helpful information (student subletting apartment). It seems that for engagement of commenting, the information did not have to be only related with the product, but also could be related with other things which were important for the audience. At the same time, this finding showed providing helpful information, such as remunerative information or having call-to-action in the contents had positive influence on commenting for foreign universities on Sina Weibo.



### 3. Call-to-Action

The findings showed having call-to-action had positive influence while not having call-to-action had negative influence. The findings indicate that at least at the research time, Sina Weibo probably was not using algorithm to give lower weight to call-to-action, at least on the engagement of commenting.

But at the same time the findings showed having call-to-action had negative influence on liking. As previous study claimed key motive for liking is to show appreciation or support (Chwialkowska 2017, 132). To the author's understanding, being asked to do something is not something deserved to be appreciated. The author interprets this might be the reason having call-to-action did not have positive influence on liking. The author interprets for audience who only planed to have lower level engagement with the contents, for example liking the contents, they probably felt being pushed by call-to-action in the contents. The author interprets this might be the reason having call-to-action had negative influence on liking.

At the last, concerning the negative influence of without call-to-action on commenting which was found in the experiment for the commissioning university, since the amount of sample contents was very limited, it is hard to say without call-to-action had negative influence on commenting for foreign universities on Sina Weibo.

### 4. Media Elements

Stephen et al. (2015, 47) claimed that having media element will not affect engagement of the content, sometimes it will even have negative influence. The findings confirm his opinion about the negative influence of having link. While for having video, the finding showed it did have negative influence on engagement performance, but the influence was limited in certain universities and on certain engagement.

For the influence of having image, findings showed having image had lower influence but not having image had higher influence. It means that audience in the case study were more sensitive about the absence of images in the contents instead the presence of images. The author interprets it might be because using image has become a widely used technique, the audience had get used to the contents with images. When there were contents without images they felt abnormal. The finding also showed that the two university groups had different reactions to the contents without images.

At the same time, the findings confirm the previous finding that reference has a lower influence (Stephen et al. 2015, 17).

- For Sharing

Similarly like the finding that entertaining contents had a higher positive influence, the finding of the higher positive influence of being humorous/funny is not surprising either. For the young audience in the research humorous or funny contents were meaning social currency and emotion. According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed that social currency and emotion drive sharing.

The finding of the higher positive influence of high relevant and negative influence of non relevant is not surprising either. Because high relevant in this research was meaning the contents were about the university itself or its programme. The high relevant contents did not only mean practical value which might be useful for the audience or their online connections but also mean social currency since the university is not any average university but a worldwide top university. According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed that Social currency and practical value drive sharing.

The finding of the higher positive influence of having video was not surprising either, although it contrasts with Stephen et al. (2015, 47) that having video does not get content higher amount of sharing or even has negative influence. Because in this research having video did not only mean there were things interesting or cool in the contents like in normal cases, but also mean there were things exotic because the contents were from the foreign universities. For the Chinese audience, it means social currency. According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed that social currency drives sharing.

Concerning the lower influence of all the other characteristics, the author found almost all of them had no direct relationship with any of the element in Berger's STEPPS principle. The author interprets that's why these characteristics did not have higher positive or negative influence on sharing.

But there were still some unexpected findings. One was the lower influence of all the characteristics related with positivity, especially high positive, negative and complicate emotion. According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed that positive and negative contents get high sharing because they have the element of emotion. The findings somehow prove the opinion from lee et al. (2014, 33) that the positive influence of emotional contents might be reduced in the future due to excessive usage.

According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed sad emotions get lower amount of sharing. The findings showed that the contents which were about the death and funeral of Stephen William Hawking were among the contents with the highest amount of sharing. This

surprising finding indicates that the element of public had more weight than the element of emotion in the case study.

While according to Botha (2014, 55), contents with complicate emotion get higher amount of sharing. In this research there was only one content in the experiment for the commission university had complicate emotion. Due to the very limited amount of sample contents, it is hard to say for foreign universities on Sina Weibo, for sharing, what was the influence of complicate emotion.

Another surprising finding was the lower influence of having reference. In the research, having reference referred to mentioning special days or hot topics in the contents. According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed that public drives sharing. The author interprets it was because having reference in the contents is also an overly used marketing technique, audience were dulled.

The last surprising finding was the lower influence of having image. Having image in this research did not only mean having something nice in the contents but also means having something exotic. According to FightMediocrity (2015), Berger (2013) claimed that social currency and social currency drives sharing. So having image was supposed to have higher positive influence. The author interprets it was because compared with having video, having image in the contents has been used more often. But an image always carries far less information than a video. So the author interprets it might be the reason why having video had a higher positive influence but having image did not.

### 5.1.3 Answer to the Research Question

After the examinations of the findings for each subquestion, the author got the answer for the research question.

For foreign universities on Sina Weibo, the type of entertaining and two characteristics, being humorous/funny, high relevant had a higher positive influence. The type of remunerative and three characteristics, low relevant, high advertising tone, and with link had a higher negative influence. Four characteristics, non relevant, with call-to-action, without image and with video had different influence on different engagement or in different universities.

As for the engagement of sharing, the type of entertaining and three characteristics, being humorous/funny, high relevant and with video had a higher positive influence. Characteristic of non relevant had a higher negative influence.

## 5.2 Contributions and Managerial Implications

### 5.2.1 Contributions

This study contributes to the existing knowledge of using contents to improve social media engagement especially for foreign universities using contents to improve social media engagement on Sina Weibo. The contributions are focused on these five following areas:

#### 1. Content with Social Media Engagement

This research studied the relationship between contents and social media engagement from two different perspectives, type of the contents and characteristic of the contents.

It confirms the previous findings that type can influence the social media engagement of the contents and entertaining contents have positive influence (Cvijikj & Michahelles 2013), remunerative contents have negative influence (Lee et al. 2014 28-29; Stephen et al. 2015, 44), and informational and relational contents have a lower influence (Lee et al. 2014).

It also confirms the previous findings that different characteristics have different influence on contents' social media engagement (Lee et al. 2014; Stephen et al. 2015). It also confirms the positive influence of being low persuasive and the negative influence of being high persuasive and having link (Stephen et al. 2015, 37-43).

At the same time the study indicates that certain types or characteristics may have positive influence on some engagement but have negative influence on other engagement.

The study also reveals that different types and characteristics may influence social media engagement by different strength. Some may influence lower level engagement, some may influence higher level engagement, some may influence both levels, while some may not have influence on any level.

#### 2. Content with Social Media Engagement of Sharing

The research studied the engagement of sharing additionally by adopting Berger's STEPPS principle.

Based on the type and characteristic of the contents there were five elements of Berger's STEPPS principle were identified in the study, they were: social currency, emotion, public, practical value and story. The study indicates that these six different elements of Berger's STEPPS principle may have different weight. Some of them may have more

importance than others. So contents with different elements of Berger's STEPPS principle may have different engagement performance.

### 3. Content from Content Marketing' Point of View vs. Content from Social Media Engagement' Point of View

This research was studying content marketing in a specific scenario, on social media, and with a specific purpose, to improve engagement. It indicates that the definition of good contents from content marketing' point of view and from social media engagement's point of view may not be always totally aligned.

For example, according to Content Marketing (n.d.) a good content is valuable. To the authors understanding it means the content has certain value for the audience. But in the research it showed that remunerative contents got low engagement on liking. So the contents which were good from content marketing' point of view were not good from social media engagement's point of view. Another example was the contents with call-to-action got high engagement on commenting in the research, but from content marketing' point of view, having call-to-action does not necessarily to be an important characteristic for a good content.

### 4. Social Media Engagement Strategies

Based on the findings about the other four case universities that being entertaining, humours/funny and high relevant had positive influence, being remunerative, and low relevant had negative influence, while relational contents and social characteristics like having call-to-action and reference either had a lower influence or had both positive and negative influence, it can be seen that the motives which were driving the audience engaging with these universities on Sina Weibo highly likely were hedonic and learning, while the motive which was preventing audience from engagement was remunerative, while the social motive did not help or harm.

At the same time in the experiment for the commission university, at the beginning of the experiments, no content got any sharing, commenting or even liking. But right after certain point in the later stage of the experiment, all of the new contents got certain amount of liking, some even got commenting. It can be seen that the motive which was driving the audience engaging the commissioning university on Sina Weibo highly likely was moral motive.

So the study indicates that social media engagement strategies works differently for different companies.

### 5. Other Factors Influencing Social Media Engagement

To the author' knowledge currently most of the academic studies about the relationship between contents and social media engagement are based on study of Facebook, limited studies are about the Chinese social media Sina Weibo. This research provides some insights about what is situation on other social medias besides Facebook, and in a specific country, China.

The research indicates that the relationship between contents and social media engagement on Sina Weibo has many things in common with the situation on Facebook but also has its own characteristics. For example audience may be not shy to share or comment the remunerative information. This study confirms the previous finding that cultural factor influences social media engagement (Chwialkowska 2017,163).

### 5.2.2 Managerial Implications

This research also has managerial implications for the commissioning university HAMK for its possible plan to improve social media engagement performance on Sina Weibo in the future. HAMK might know how to use contents to improve social media engagement on other platforms, but might not be familiar with Sina Weibo. Therefore, this thesis provides insight for HAMK.

First, on Sina Weibo it is possible for HAMK to improve social media engagement by utilizing type or characteristic of the contents, that is try to use the ones which have higher positive influence and avoid to use the ones which have higher negative influence. But at the same time HAMK needs be aware that certain types or characteristics might have different influence on different engagement. So HAMK needs to prioritize which engagement performance is more important.

Second, specially for improving the engagement performance of sharing, HAMK needs to be aware that some elements in the contents might have more weight than others. For example, emotion or public value in the content might be more important than the practical value or social currency.

Third, HAMK needs to know that a good content which gets more engagement on Sina Weibo does not have to a good content from content' marketing' point view. So the contents which have been proved to have good performance in other channels for HAMK might not get good engagement on Sina Weibo, while the contents which might get good engagement on Sina Weibo does not necessarily to be the good contents HAMK has been familiar with. So in order to improve engagement performance on Sina Weibo, HAMK can apply it's successful content marketing experience but also needs to explore more about the uniqueness of Sina Weibo.

Then, HAMK needs to choose a more suitable strategy. As mentioned before, it was clearly that harnessing moral motives worked for HAMK. There were certain types or characteristics in the experiment indicated other strategies probably also worked for HAMK, but since the amount of sample contents was very limited, it is hard to say did they really work for HAMK or not.

At the last, using contents to marketing on Sina Weibo to improve engagement performance also asks HAMK to take the cultural factor into consideration. There are some cultural differences might influence the performance. For example, the way people handle remunerative information might be different on Sina Weibo with on other platforms.

### 5.3 Limitations and Directions

This section describes the limitations of this study, and suggests directions for future study.

#### 5.3.1 Limitations

First, besides the commissioning university, the guideline for choosing the other four foreign universities for the case study which was one from US, one from UK and two from Finland was suggested by the commissioning university. From the point of view of learning from other foreign universities' successful experience of social media engagement on Sina Weibo, in the author' point of view, not all of these four universities were highly suitable for the case study.

Especially concerning the difference between HAMK and the two universities from US and UK, the practical value of the findings from the case study of these two universities need to be evaluated carefully, especially the findings about the engagement of sharing and commenting. Because in these two studies all the contents were only chosen from the two universities from US and UK, but there was no suitable contents from the two universities from Finland could be chosen as sample contents for the case study.

Second, due to the limited resources the author had for the thesis, the study used limited amount of contents in the content analysis part. The coding step was done by the author herself without assistance from others to make sure there was no coding errors happened in the coding process.

Third, this thesis studied how types and characteristics influenced social media engagement separately, without considering the interaction effect between content types and characteristics or the interaction effect among different characteristics. For example, in the case study there

could be contents with good engagement performance had more than one characteristics which all had positive influence. It was hard to know which one of them was the reason for the content getting good engagement performance.

Then, even though the author used detailed description to define each type and characteristic there still were situations when it was hard to define them. For example, some contents had elements belonged to different content types. In this case, the author defined the type for the content based the element which was in the dominating position in the contents.

Another limitation is that this thesis did not take the influence of other content-related factors into consideration in the analysis process. For example, posting time of the contents. These factors probably also influenced the engagement performance of the contents.

The last limitation is that even though in this thesis the author picked up the engagement of sharing and studied it additionally, this study was still a general one. Other engagement behaviours, for example, lurking, liking, commenting were not studied specifically in this study. In the study of sharing, the author explored a little bit of the possible difference among the six elements in Berger's STEPPS principle but it did not study it further due to the limited resources the author had.

### 5.3.2 Directions for Future Study

Based on the findings from this study, the author suggests that with more recourse, for example better computer skills and more human resources, there are couple possible directions for future study.

First, the author suggests studying the interaction effect between content types and characteristics or the interaction effect among different characteristics. For example, the study found informational and relational contents had lower influence on social media engagement, which means with certain characteristics they got higher engagement while with certain characteristics they got lower engagement. Future studies can try to find out which specific characteristics cause different engagement performance for these two content types.

Second, future studies are suggested integrating other content-related factors into the study, for example, posting time, to see will the same type of contents get different engagement just because they are posted at different time.

Third, future studies can explore more about Berger's STEPPS principle to see is that true that different elements in the principle have different weight and which ones in which situations have more or less weight.



Then, future studies can investigate more about other engagement behaviours besides sharing. Because all the engagement behaviours are meaningful for the company to certain extent.

Finally, this study indicated the influence of cultural factors on content's social media engagement performance. Future studies can explore more about how specifically the influence can be.

## REFERENCES

Berger, J. & Milkman, C. (2012). What Makes Online Content Viral? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 49(2), 192-205.

Botha, E. M. (2014). *Contagious Communications: The Role of emotion in viral marketing*. Dissertation. Stockholm KTH Royal Institute of Technology. Retrieved 11 July 2018 from <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:745835/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

Chwialkowska, A. (2017). *Motivational drivers of engagement with company social media content: cross-cultural perspective*. Dissertation. Acta Wasaensia 373. Retrieved 11 July 2018 from [https://www.univaasa.fi/materiaali/pdf/isbn\\_978-952-476-738-5.pdf](https://www.univaasa.fi/materiaali/pdf/isbn_978-952-476-738-5.pdf)

Content Marketing Institute (n.d.). What is Content Marketing? Retrieved 3 May 2018 from <https://contentmarketinginstitute.com/what-is-content-marketing/>

Cvijikj, I. P. & Michahelles, F. (2013). Online engagement factors on Facebook brand pages. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 3(4), 843-861.

Dahl, S. (2015). *Social Media Marketing Theories and Applications*. Los Angeles: Sage.

De Vries, N. J, & Carlson, J. (2014). Examining the Drivers and Brand Performance Implications of Customer Engagement with Brands in the Social Media Environment. *Journal of Brand Management*, 21(6), 495-515.

D. Hollebeek, L. & Chen, T. (2014). Exploring Positively-vs. Negatively-Valenced Brand Engagement: A Conceptual Model. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(1), 62-74.

Dolan, R. M (2015). *Social Media Engagement Behaviour: A Users and Gratifications Perspective* Dissertation. Adelaide. University of Adelaide. Retrieved 2 May 2018 from <https://digital.library.adelaide.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/2440/109817/2/02whole.pdf>

Du Plessis, C. (2017). Towards a more universal understanding of content marketing: the contribution of academic research. *Proceedings of the 6th Business & Management Conference, Geneva*. 41-54. Retrieved 2 May 2018 from <http://www.iises.net/proceedings/6th-business-management-conference-geneva-56/table-of-content/detail?article=towards-a-more-universal-understanding-of-content-marketing-the-contribution-of-academic-research>.

Fieseler, C. (2015). How to engage social media audiences. Retrieved 2 May 2018 from <https://www.bi.edu/research/business-review/articles/2015/06/how-to-engage-social-media-audiences/>

FightMediocrity: Contagious: Why things catch on by Jonah Berger / Animated Review (2015) 13. 8. 2018. Video. Retrieved 4 November 2018 from <https://www.youtube.com>

HAMK (n.d.). About HAMK. Retrieved 9 July 2018 from <https://www.hamk.fi/hame-university-of-applied-sciences/?lang=en>

HAMK (n.d.). HAMK. Retrieved 9 July 2018 from <http://www.hamk.fi/english/Sivut/default.aspx>

HAMK (n.d.). HAMK to modernise education in China. Retrieved 9 July 2018 from <http://www.hamk.fi/english/applicants/Sivut/hamk-to-modernise-education-in-china.aspx>

Khan, M. (2017). Social media engagement: What motivates user participation and consumption on YouTube . *Computers in Human Behavior*, 66, 236-247.

Lee, D., Hosanagar, K., & Nair, H. S. (2014). *The effect of social media marketing content on consumer engagement: Evidence from Facebook*. Research Papers from Stanford University, Graduate School of Business. Stanford: Stanford University. Retrieved 2 May 2018 from [https://mackinstitute.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/FP0170\\_Hosanagar-Kartik.pdf](https://mackinstitute.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/FP0170_Hosanagar-Kartik.pdf)

Malthouse, E. C., Haenlein, M., Skiera, B., Wege, E., & Zhang, M. (2013). Managing Customer Relationships in the Social Media Era: Introducing the Social CRM House. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 27(4), 270–280.

Marteko (2014). The Definitive Guide to Engaging Content Marketing. Retrieved 9 July 2018 from <https://go.marketo.com/rs/marketob2/images/DG2ECM.pdf>

McCay-Peet, L., & Quan-Haase, A. (2016). A model of social media engagement: User profiles, gratifications, and experiences . In H. O'Brien & M. Lalmas (Eds.), *Why engagement matters: Cross-disciplinary perspectives and innovations on user engagement with digital media*. Heidelberg: Springer Verlag, 199-217.

Meikle, G. (2015). *Social Media*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Nielsen, J. (2006). The 90-9-1 Rule for Participation Inequality in Social Media and Online Communities. Retrieved 11 July 2018 from <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/participation-inequality/>

Pažeraitė, A. & Repovienė, R. (2016). Content marketing elements and their influence on search advertisement effectiveness: theoretical background and practical insights. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, 75(7), 97-109.

Peruta, A. & Shields, A. (2018). Marketing your university on social media: a content analysis of Facebook post types and format. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 28(2), 175-191.

Rose, S., Spinks, N., & Canhoto, A. I. (2014). Quantitative content analysis. In S. Rose; N, Spinks, & Canhoto, N. (eds.) *Management Research: Applying the Principles*. New York: Routledge. Retrieved 22 July 2018 from [http://documents.routledge-interactive.s3.amazonaws.com/9780415628129/Chapter%206%20-%20Quantitative%20content%20analysis%20final\\_edited.pdf](http://documents.routledge-interactive.s3.amazonaws.com/9780415628129/Chapter%206%20-%20Quantitative%20content%20analysis%20final_edited.pdf)

Stephen, A. T., Sciandra, M., & Inman, J. (2015). Is it what you say or how you say it? How content characteristics affect consumer engagement with brands on Facebook. *Saïd Business School, WP 2015-19*. University of Oxford. Retrieved 3 May 2018 from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2683314>

Syrdal, H. A. (2016). *Exploring Engagement with Social Media Content* Dissertation. University of Texas Arlington. Dissertation. Arlington. The University of Texas at Arlington. Retrieved 11 July 2018 from <https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/handle/10106/26153>

Törőcsik, M.; Szűcs, K. & Kehl, D. (2014). How Generations Think: Research on Generation Z. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Communicatio*, 1, 23-45.

Tuten, T. L., & Solomon, M. R (2015). *Social Media Marketing*. Los Angeles: Sage.

University of Southern California. (2018). Organizing Your Social Sciences Research Paper: Writing a Case Study. Retrieved 20 October 2018 from <https://libguides.usc.edu/WRITINGGUIDE/CASESTUDY>

Villi, M. & Matikainen, J. (2016). Participation in Social Media: Studying Explicit and Implicit Forms of Participation in Communicative Social Networks. *Media and Communication*, 4(4), 109-117.

Weibo (n.d.). Business Overview. Retrieved 20 October 2018 from <http://ir.weibo.com/corporate-profile>

Wikipedia (2018). Sina Weibo. Retrieved 9 July 2018 from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sina\\_Weibo](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sina_Weibo)

## Appendix 1

## Content Pool of Group A

S/N	University	Share Amount	Comment Amount	Like Amount
1	Cambridge	4	8	134
2	Cambridge	47	5	80
3	Cambridge	5	15	68
4	Cambridge	16	9	150
5	Cambridge	23	9	46
6	Cambridge	3	0	46
7	Cambridge	55	32	286
8	Cambridge	1	22	57
9	Yale	0	4	40
10	Cambridge	0	4	48
11	Cambridge	1	1	16
12	Cambridge	3	20	100
13	Cambridge	3	52	56
14	Cambridge	26	5	73
15	Cambridge	7	4	139
16	Cambridge	27	4	67
17	Cambridge	1	1	32
18	Cambridge	1	1	36
19	Cambridge	0	54	54
20	Cambridge	40	13	112
21	Cambridge	0	3	24
22	Cambridge	3	0	16
23	Cambridge	7	0	15
24	Cambridge	3	0	31
25	Cambridge	19	0	27
26	Cambridge	33	30	125
27	Cambridge	17	7	191
28	Cambridge	1	8	70
29	Cambridge	80	13	127
30	Cambridge	1	1	54
31	Cambridge	7	4	175
32	Cambridge	12	12	131
33	Cambridge	75	2	87
34	Cambridge	39	3	120
35	Cambridge	31	15	148
36	Cambridge	16	9	124
37	Cambridge	119	48	524
38	Cambridge	37	10	163
39	Cambridge	0	0	28
40	Cambridge	7	10	141
41	Cambridge	11	20	186
42	Cambridge	23	13	209
43	Cambridge	22	19	279

S/N	University	Share Amount	Comment Amount	Like Amount
44	Cambridge	18	15	206
45	Cambridge	39	11	83
46	Cambridge	7	20	290
47	Cambridge	29	12	102
48	Cambridge	12	1	45
49	Cambridge	8	4	119
50	Cambridge	9	2	64
51	Cambridge	10	6	94
52	Cambridge	4	1	42
53	Cambridge	10	6	71
54	Cambridge	5	2	44
55	Cambridge	2	1	66
56	Cambridge	11	4	115
57	Cambridge	21	2	67
58	Cambridge	5	2	53
59	Cambridge	17	7	77
60	Cambridge	7	1	19
61	Cambridge	2	1	34
62	Cambridge	10	2	74
63	Cambridge	9	11	75
64	Cambridge	11	1	86
65	Cambridge	15	8	98
66	Cambridge	8	3	45
67	Cambridge	14	5	52
68	Cambridge	2	3	17
69	Cambridge	9	6	45
70	Cambridge	9	5	61
71	Cambridge	2	3	101
72	Cambridge	16	5	58
73	Cambridge	5	2	101
74	Cambridge	2	1	51
75	Cambridge	11	4	52
76	Cambridge	4	2	48
77	Cambridge	7	3	29
78	Cambridge	8	11	47
79	Cambridge	19	5	115
80	Cambridge	9	3	53
81	Cambridge	6	3	57
82	Cambridge	7	6	64
83	Cambridge	6	1	61
84	Cambridge	14	5	89
85	Cambridge	19	2	72
86	Cambridge	6	4	45
87	Cambridge	3	1	34

S/N	University	Share Amount	Comment Amount	Like Amount
88	Cambridge	7	1	35
89	Cambridge	6	1	38
90	Cambridge	3	5	33
91	Cambridge	15	6	99
92	Cambridge	5	3	90
93	Cambridge	9	3	85
94	Cambridge	6	4	75
95	Cambridge	6	5	48
96	Cambridge	6	4	86
97	Cambridge	8	9	71
98	Cambridge	10	4	92
99	Cambridge	3	1	67
100	Cambridge	3	3	97
101	Yale	27	2	67
102	Yale	13	0	21
103	Yale	2	0	10
104	Yale	1	4	15
105	Yale	0	3	71
106	Yale	10	13	82
107	Yale	16	41	123
108	Yale	2	4	13
109	Yale	1	1	41
110	Yale	5	0	66
111	Yale	1	1	48
112	Yale	0	2	14
113	Cambridge	0	4	60
114	Yale	1	3	25
115	Yale	3	4	16
116	Yale	2	3	15
117	Yale	3	15	118
118	Yale	1	1	26
119	Yale	31	6	39
120	Yale	1	7	25
121	Yale	3	3	16
122	Yale	3	0	24
123	Yale	1	0	14
124	Yale	2	0	27
125	Yale	1	3	28
126	Yale	2	16	52
127	Yale	1	0	29
128	Yale	15	19	168
129	Yale	1	2	40
130	Yale	6	0	13
131	Yale	5	0	34

S/N	University	Share Amount	Comment Amount	Like Amount
132	Yale	84	12	113
133	Yale	3	5	53
134	Yale	5	5	56
135	Yale	3	2	28
136	Yale	3	2	29
137	Yale	12	2	28
138	Yale	12	3	23
139	Yale	8	12	70
140	Yale	6	11	44
141	Yale	4	2	49
142	Yale	3	3	22
143	Yale	8	9	92
144	Yale	6	6	53
145	Yale	2	5	44
146	Yale	10	7	106
147	Yale	4	5	61
148	Yale	7	5	66
149	Yale	5	5	91
150	Yale	10	4	50
151	Yale	6	5	66
152	Yale	2	4	87
153	Yale	9	6	65
154	Yale	2	1	19
155	Yale	5	3	31
156	Yale	2	3	19
157	Yale	5	8	52
158	Yale	5	4	35
159	Yale	9	8	72
160	Yale	4	8	66
161	Yale	2	4	19
162	Yale	2	5	43
163	Yale	9	9	71
164	Yale	3	9	54
165	Yale	4	2	50
166	Yale	13	8	49
167	Yale	4	5	74
168	Yale	3	2	30
169	Yale	4	6	67
170	Yale	7	6	74
171	Yale	5	4	38
172	Yale	2	1	42
173	Yale	4	5	87
174	Yale	2	3	46
175	Yale	8	6	22



<b>S/N</b>	<b>University</b>	<b>Share Amount</b>	<b>Comment Amount</b>	<b>Like Amount</b>
176	Yale	5	2	41
177	Yale	9	11	34
178	Yale	5	1	31
179	Yale	6	4	39
180	Yale	4	1	25
181	Yale	2	1	25
182	Yale	5	11	53
183	Yale	4	4	56
184	Yale	5	5	115
185	Yale	2	4	41
186	Yale	8	3	46
187	Yale	3	4	52
188	Yale	2	9	52
189	Yale	5	5	18
190	Yale	15	8	91
191	Yale	8	8	108
192	Yale	7	3	51
193	Yale	13	4	45
194	Yale	4	3	18
195	Yale	4	4	57
196	Yale	3	11	62
197	Yale	2	5	61
198	Yale	7	7	62
199	Yale	4	6	52
200	Yale	7	1	60

## Content Pool of Group B

S/N	Universtiy	Share Amount	Comment Amount	Like Amount
1	Oulu	0	5	2
2	Oulu	0	0	0
3	Oulu	0	0	0
4	Oulu	1	3	0
5	Oulu	1	0	0
6	Oulu	0	0	12
7	Oulu	0	4	9
8	Oulu	0	11	1
9	Oulu	0	1	13
10	Oulu	6	1	11
11	Oulu	0	0	0
12	Oulu	1	5	1
13	Oulu	3	0	3
14	Oulu	0	7	8
15	Oulu	1	4	5
16	Oulu	4	26	14
17	Oulu	0	4	3
18	OAMK	1	2	14
19	OAMK	0	1	12
20	OAMK	0	4	6
21	OAMK	5	1	10
22	OAMK	3	0	10
23	OAMK	3	1	9
24	OAMK	4	0	5
25	OAMK	2	2	12
26	OAMK	7	6	11
27	OAMK	1	1	11
28	OAMK	4	1	16
29	Oulu	0	1	3
30	Oulu	0	1	4
31	Oulu	1	0	4
32	Oulu	0	0	5
33	Oulu	0	0	6
34	Oulu	0	0	1
35	Oulu	0	0	2
36	Oulu	0	0	2
37	Oulu	1	1	2
38	Oulu	1	1	1
39	Oulu	0	0	2
40	Oulu	0	2	7
41	Oulu	0	1	5
42	Oulu	0	0	1

S/N	Universtiy	Share Amount	Comment Amount	Like Amount
43	Oulu	1	1	4
44	Oulu	0	0	1
45	Oulu	0	0	4
46	Oulu	0	0	1
47	Oulu	0	1	1
48	Oulu	2	1	4
49	Oulu	0	0	4
50	Oulu	1	1	3
51	Oulu	1	0	5
52	Oulu	0	0	2
53	Oulu	0	0	4
54	Oulu	0	0	5
55	Oulu	1	1	3
56	Oulu	0	0	4
57	Oulu	1	0	2
58	Oulu	0	0	2
59	Oulu	0	0	2
60	Oulu	0	0	3
61	Oulu	1	1	3
62	Oulu	1	1	1
63	Oulu	0	1	1
64	Oulu	0	0	2
65	Oulu	0	0	3
66	Oulu	0	0	5
67	Oulu	2	0	5
68	Oulu	1	2	3
69	Oulu	0	1	2
70	Oulu	1	1	1
71	Oulu	1	0	1
72	Oulu	0	0	1
73	Oulu	0	0	8
74	Oulu	0	0	2
75	Oulu	0	0	1
76	Oulu	1	1	4
77	Oulu	1	1	4
78	Oulu	0	0	1
79	Oulu	0	0	2
80	Oulu	0	0	1
81	Oulu	0	1	2
82	Oulu	2	0	3
83	Oulu	1	1	7
84	Oulu	0	1	4
85	Oulu	0	0	5
86	Oulu	0	0	2

S/N	Universtiy	Share Amount	Comment Amount	Like Amount
87	Oulu	0	1	3
88	Oulu	2	2	4
89	Oulu	0	0	4
90	Oulu	0	0	3
91	Oulu	1	0	2
92	Oulu	0	1	4
93	Oulu	0	0	5
94	Oulu	0	0	1
95	Oulu	2	2	6
96	Oulu	1	1	2
97	Oulu	0	0	6
98	Oulu	0	0	7
99	Oulu	0	0	2
100	Oulu	0	2	1
101	Oulu	0	0	4
102	Oulu	0	0	3
103	Oulu	0	0	1
104	Oulu	0	3	4
105	Oulu	0	0	2
106	Oulu	0	0	2
107	Oulu	0	1	4
108	Oulu	0	2	1
109	Oulu	0	0	2
110	Oulu	0	0	1
111	Oulu	0	0	2
112	OAMK	0	0	2
113	OAMK	0	2	3
114	OAMK	0	1	2
115	OAMK	0	0	2
116	OAMK	0	0	2
117	OAMK	0	0	1
118	OAMK	0	0	5
119	OAMK	2	1	7
120	OAMK	0	0	6
121	OAMK	0	0	5
122	OAMK	0	0	4
123	OAMK	0	0	5
124	OAMK	0	0	8
125	OAMK	0	0	6
126	OAMK	1	1	6
127	OAMK	1	0	10
128	OAMK	0	1	6
129	OAMK	0	0	8
130	OAMK	0	0	6

S/N	Universtiy	Share Amount	Comment Amount	Like Amount
131	OAMK	0	0	5
132	OAMK	0	0	5
133	OAMK	0	3	6
134	OAMK	0	0	5
135	OAMK	1	0	4
136	OAMK	0	0	7
137	OAMK	0	0	7
138	OAMK	0	0	7
139	OAMK	0	1	7
140	OAMK	0	0	8
141	OAMK	0	0	9
142	OAMK	0	0	6
143	OAMK	1	0	6
144	OAMK	0	0	8
145	OAMK	0	0	7
146	OAMK	0	0	9
147	OAMK	0	0	9
148	OAMK	0	0	8
149	OAMK	0	0	7
150	OAMK	0	0	10
151	OAMK	0	1	9
152	OAMK	0	0	7
153	OAMK	0	3	10
154	OAMK	1	0	7
155	OAMK	0	0	9
156	OAMK	0	1	7
157	OAMK	0	0	9
158	OAMK	0	0	8
159	OAMK	0	0	9
160	OAMK	0	0	10
161	OAMK	0	0	9
162	OAMK	0	0	9
163	OAMK	1	2	6
164	OAMK	0	0	6
165	OAMK	0	0	6
166	OAMK	0	0	6
167	OAMK	0	0	8
168	OAMK	0	0	7
169	OAMK	0	0	9
170	OAMK	0	0	10
171	OAMK	1	1	9
172	OAMK	0	1	10
173	OAMK	1	0	9
174	OAMK	0	0	9

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Universtiy</b>	<b>Share Amount</b>	<b>Comment Amount</b>	<b>Like Amount</b>
175	OAMK	2	2	10
176	OAMK	0	0	9
177	OAMK	1	0	8
178	OAMK	0	0	8
179	OAMK	2	1	7
180	OAMK	1	0	8
181	OAMK	1	0	9
182	OAMK	1	1	8
183	OAMK	0	0	7
184	OAMK	1	0	7
185	OAMK	0	1	8
186	OAMK	0	0	4
187	OAMK	0	0	4
188	OAMK	0	0	7
189	OAMK	0	0	5
190	OAMK	0	3	10
191	OAMK	1	0	5
192	OAMK	1	0	4

## Content Pool of Group C

<b>S/N</b>	<b>University</b>	<b>Share Amount</b>	<b>Comment Amount</b>	<b>Like Amount</b>
1	HAMK	0	0	0
2	HAMK	0	0	0
3	HAMK	0	0	0
4	HAMK	0	0	0
5	HAMK	0	0	0
6	HAMK	0	0	1
7	HAMK	0	0	1
8	HAMK	0	8	1
9	HAMK	0	0	3
10	HAMK	0	0	1
11	HAMK	0	1	2
12	HAMK	0	0	1
13	HAMK	0	0	1
14	HAMK	0	0	1
15	HAMK	0	0	1
16	HAMK	0	0	1
17	HAMK	0	0	1
18	HAMK	0	6	4
19	HAMK	0	0	2
20	HAMK	0	0	2

## Coding Result for Study of Sharing

S/N	Study	Group	University	Performance	Performance Amount	Content Type	Positivity	Relevance	Advertising Tone	Humourous/Funny	Call-to-Action	Reference	Link	Image	Video
1	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	80	I	M	H	M	N	N	N	N	N	Y
2	Share	A	Yale	Level Bad	0	R	L	L	L	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
3	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Bad		I	M	L	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N
4	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	37	I	H	H	H	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
5	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	75	E	H	L	L	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
6	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	R	M	M	L	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
7	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	55	R	H	L	M	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
8	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	R	H	M	M	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
9	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	R	L	N	L	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
10	Share	A	Yale	Level Bad	0	R	H	L	L	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
11	Share	A	Yale	Level Bad	1	R	N	N	L	N	N	N	N	N	N
12	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	39	I	M	H	M	N	N	N	N	N	Y
13	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	R	L	N	L	N	Y	N	N	N	N
14	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	119	E	N	L	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
15	Share	A	Yale	Level Bad	1	R	H	M	H	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
16	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	39	E	L	L	L	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
17	Share	A	Yale	Level Good	84	I	H	H	H	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
18	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	40	I	M	H	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N
19	Share	A	Cambridge	Level Good	47	I	M	M	M	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
20	Share	A	Yale	Level Bad	0	I	L	L	M	N	N	N	Y	Y	N



## Coding Result for Study of Commenting

S/N	Study	Case Group	Case University	Performance	Performance Amount	Content Type	Positivity	Relevance	Advertising Tone	Humourous/Funny	Call-to-Action	Reference	Link	Image	Video
1	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	30	E	M	L	M	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
2	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	I	N	M	M	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
3	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	E	M	L	L	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	32	R	H	L	M	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
5	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	20	R	H	M	L	N	N	N	N	Y	N
6	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	20	R	H	M	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N
7	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	20	R	N	L	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
8	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	22	R	N	L	L	N	N	N	N	N	N
9	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	R	M	L	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N
10	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	54	R	L	N	L	N	Y	N	N	N	N
11	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	52	R	L	N	L	N	Y	N	N	N	N
12	Comment	A	Yale	Level Bad	0	I	L	L	L	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
13	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	I	L	L	L	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
14	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	0	I	L	L	L	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
15	Comment	A	Cambridge	Level Good	48	E	N	L	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
16	Comment	A	Yale	Level Bad	0	R	L	M	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N
17	Comment	A	Yale	Level Bad	0	R	M	M	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N
18	Comment	A	Yale	Level Bad	0	R	H	M	H	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
19	Comment	A	Yale	Level Good	41	I	H	M	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N
20	Comment	A	Yale	Level Bad	0	I	H	M	M	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
21	Comment	C	HAMK	Level Good	8	E	H	L	L	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
22	Comment	C	HAMK	Level Good	1	E	H	L	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N
23	Comment	C	HAMK	Level Good	6	E	H	L	M	Y	N	N	N	Y	N

## Coding Result for Study of Liking

S/N	Study	Case Group	Case University	Performance	Performance Amount	Content Type	Positivity	Relevance	Advertising Tone	Humourous/Funny	Call-to-Action	Reference	Link	Image	Video	
1	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	279	I	H	H	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
2	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	206	I	L	H	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
3	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	175	I	L	H	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
4	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	286	R	H	L	M	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	
5	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	290	R	H	M	L	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
6	Like	A	Yale	Level Bad	13	I	H	M	M	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
7	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	16	I	H	M	M	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
8	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	186	R	N	L	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	
9	Like	A	Yale	Level Bad	15	R	N	N	L	N	N	N	N	N	N	
10	Like	A	Yale	Level Bad	13	R	H	N	L	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
11	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	209	E	L	H	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
12	Like	A	Yale	Level Bad	168	R	H	L	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	
13	Like	A	Yale	Level Bad	10	I	L	L	L	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	
14	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	16	I	L	L	L	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
15	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	15	I	L	L	L	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
16	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	524	E	N	L	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	
17	Like	A	Yale	Level Bad	15	R	M	M	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
18	Like	A	Yale	Level Bad	14	R	H	M	H	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
19	Like	A	Cambridge	Level Bad	191	I	M	M	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
20	Like	A	Yale	Level Bad	14	I	L	L	M	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
21	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	0	R	H	N	L	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
22	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	1	I	L	H	H	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	
23	Like	B	OAMK	Level Bad	1	R	M	N	L	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
24	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	0	I	H	H	H	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
25	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	0	I	H	H	H	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
26	Like	B	OAMK	Level Bad	16	I	H	H	L	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
27	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	14	I	L	H	M	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	
28	Like	B	OAMK	Level Bad	11	R	L	N	L	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	
29	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	0	I	L	H	M	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
30	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	1	R	H	N	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	
31	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	0	I	L	L	L	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
32	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	1	I	M	L	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
33	Like	B	OAMK	Level Bad	11	I	M	M	M	N	N	N	N	N	Y	
34	Like	B	OAMK	Level Bad	14	I	M	H	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
35	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	1	I	L	M	L	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
36	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	12	I	H	M	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
37	Like	B	OAMK	Level Bad	12	I	M	M	L	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
38	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	11	R	H	M	M	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	
39	Like	B	OAMK	Level Bad	12	E	H	N	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
40	Like	B	Oulu	Level Bad	13	R	H	N	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	
41	Like	C	HAMK	All Level	0	E	H	N	M	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	
42	Like	C	HAMK		0	E	M	N	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	
43	Like	C	HAMK		0	I	M	H	M	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	
44	Like	C	HAMK		0	I	H	L	M	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
45	Like	C	HAMK		0	I	M	H	H	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	
46	Like	C	HAMK		1	E	M	L	M	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	
47	Like	C	HAMK		1	R	H	L	L	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	
48	Like	C	HAMK		1	E	H	L	L	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	
49	Like	C	HAMK		3	E	H	N	M	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
50	Like	C	HAMK		1	R	M	L	M	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
51	Like	C	HAMK		2	E	H	L	M	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
52	Like	C	HAMK		1	E	H	L	M	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
53	Like	C	HAMK		1	E	M	N	L	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
54	Like	C	HAMK		1	E	L	M	L	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
55	Like	C	HAMK		1	R	M	L	L	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
56	Like	C	HAMK		1	E	M	N	L	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
57	Like	C	HAMK		1	E	H	L	H	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
58	Like	C	HAMK		4	E	H	L	M	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
59	Like	C	HAMK		2	E	M	N	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
60	Like	C	HAMK		2	R	C	M	M	M	N	Y	N	N	Y	N