Nonprofit organizations on Facebook

A comparative corpus-based analysis of UNICEF and WWF's communication strategies on Facebook

Louise Hallsten

Non-profit organizations on Facebook

A comparative corpus-based analysis of UNICEF and WWF's communication strategies on Facebook

Louise Hallsten

Abstract

UNICEF and WWF are leading nonprofit organizations in their field. They work globally with different projects and programs, trying to make a change for the better. This study examines and discusses the communication strategies used by nonprofit organizations in their Facebook posts by answering following questions: What communication strategies can be identified in UNICEF and WWF's Facebook posts in their aim to attract followers? Are there any linguistic patterns associated with those strategies? Are there any differences/similarities between the two organizations? The method used is based on corpus linguistics and discourse analysis, categorizing messages into the categories Information, Community and Action. The results show that both organizations mainly produce messages that are information based. They use less of the Community building and Action strategies. Some linguistic patterns were found to be associated with these strategies. These patterns were mostly connected to the communication strategy of Information.

Keywords

Contents

1 Introduction

Since the beginning of 21st century, social media has grown tremendously and today it is an important platform for nonprofit organizations all around the world. Social media offers a low-cost interactive environment for organizations to mobilize followers and attract attention to different issues that might be ignored by traditional media. Facebook as well as Twitter are free sites and have built-in interactivity for any organization, regardless of size or economy to start building a network of followers. In fact, nonprofit organizations are among the most active social media users (Barns & Andonian, 2011) with Facebook as a leading social media tool for organizations (Cho, Schweickart, & Haase, 2014).

A handful of studies have examined nonprofit organizations' social media use, often focusing on communication strategies related to interaction and public engagement. Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) did a research on nonprofit organizations' social media strategies on the microblog Twitter. The results show that organizations use Twitter as a one-way communication for sharing information, rather than a two-way communication for interacting with the public. Waters, Burnett, Lamm and Lucas (2009) have investigated organizational social media communication on Facebook. Their study included 275 nonprofit organization profiles on Facebook and the results show that the most commonly used message dissemination strategy was providing links to external news stories, photographs and discussion boards. So far, no study has analysed linguistic features of these strategies, which this study aims to do. Two nonprofit organizations were chosen for the current study, UNICEF and WWF. Both of them are leading organizations in their field. They both work globally with different programs and have regional offices located around the world. Their mission and goal is to make a change for the better, whether it is helping children, animals or saving nature.

This essay will investigate what communication strategies can be identified in UNICEF and WWF's Facebook posts, as well as examine if there are any linguistic patterns associated with these strategies.

1.1 Purpose and research questions

The purpose of this study is to analyse communication strategies and linguistic patterns related to these strategies in Facebook posts produced by the two nonprofit organizations, UNICEF and WWF. The following research questions have been formulated to fulfill the objectives of the research:

- What communication strategies can be identified in UNICEF and WWF's Facebook posts in their aim to attract followers?
- Are there any linguistic patterns associated with those strategies?
- Are there any differences/similarities between the two nonprofit organizations with different focuses?

To answer these questions, a combined approach of qualitative and quantitative analysis will be used. Communication strategies will be identified using Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) categorization scheme. For the lexical analysis, corpus linguistic tools will be used to identify and analyse the context of keywords and lexical bundles.

2 Literature review

Previous studies have shown that nonprofit organizations mainly use social media to disseminate information, despite it being a relationship building tool. Several studies have investigated which social media applications and features are used by nonprofit organizations and to what extent (Guo & Saxton, 2014, Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, Saxton & Waters, 2014, Waters et al. 2009, Waters & Jamal, 2011). These studies focus on the organizational side of the relationship and the primary communicative feature of social media platforms – the messages posted by the organizations.

Waters and Jamal's (2011) study of 81 nonprofit organizations' messages on Twitter, revealed a large amount of informational messages conveying one-way conversation. They argued that nonprofit organizations showed a willingness to share information and an unwillingness to answer questions or respond to followers' comments.

Guo and Saxon's (2014) study also focuses on Twitter messages. They investigated 188 "Civil Rights and Advocacy" organizations from the United States in order to find out how nonprofit organizations use social media to engage in advocacy work. Their study made an important contribution to the existing literature, as previous studies focused more on *whether* organizations utilize social media and their study focuses on *how*. Guo and Saxton provided a framework for understanding the process through which nonprofit organizations use social media. The results show that a majority of the tweets sent by the organization were aimed at providing information, followed by community-building and then calling to action. At stage one, the main priority is to reach out and bring awareness of the cause. These messages are predominantly informational. At stage two, their priority switches to sustaining communities of interests and networks of supporters. The messages are less formal and focus more on

community building and interactive conversations with followers. Stage three is the so called "call to action" messages, the phase where people start making a change.

Waters, Burnett, Lamm and Lucas (2009) study of 275 randomly sampled legally incorporated nonprofit organizations' Facebook profiles shows that most organizations failed to take advantage of the interactive nature of social media. They rarely post information in forms other than external links, photographs and discussion boards. The results show that the most common strategy to involve the followers was by providing e-mail addresses to organizational representatives.

Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) analysed messages sent by nonprofit organizations on Twitter. Their main aim of the study was to analyse the content of tweets and determine what communicative function they had. They analysed the posts published by nonprofit organizations and developed a categorization scheme divided into three main categories Information, Community, Action. Their results show that informational tweets were predominant, followed by Community and lastly Action. Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) argue that dialogue and community-building may not be the key form of social media communication by nonprofit organizations however the overwhelming majority of organizations use community-building strategies in their communication as well.

Saxton and Waters (2014) applied Lovejoy and Saxton's (2012) division of posts Information, Community, Action in their study of what stakeholders like, comment on and share on Facebook. Their conclusion is that the likelihood of public interacting with the site is higher if the organization uses the community-building strategy. These posts encourage more interaction and dialogue compared to information-based posts. The posts with a clear objective to call on the public attention received the highest level of public engagement when it came to likes. Posts containing information about events, requests for donations or information about realization got the worst impact.

As shown above, the use of social media by nonprofit organizations has been a discussed topic in recent years. The current study aims to further investigate the communication strategies used by nonprofit organizations, based upon the framework proposed by Lovejoy and Saxton (2012).

3 Methodology

3.1 Material

The material used in this study consist of Facebook posts from @unicef and @worldwildlifefund. 750 posts were randomly selected, 375 posts from each Facebook-page. @unicef is the international page for UNICEF, created in 2009 and operating from New York. It has 7.5 million followers and an equal number of people liking the page (2019-03-20). WWF's international Facebook page operates from Switzerland and the posts are written in multiple languages. Therefore, the US page is used instead for this study. The US page @worldwildlifefund operates from Washington DC and the posts are only in English. They do

not refer to the US in their posts and can therefore be seen as an international page. It was created in 2008 and has 2.798 059 people liking the page and 2.747 348 followers (2019-03-20).

Two main corpora were compiled for this study. These two corpora were then divided into two sub-corpora "popular posts" and "less popular" posts. The popular posts are posts with more than 1.200 likes and the less popular posts have less than 600 likes. The two sub-corpora with more than 1200 likes consist of 250 posts each while the sub-corpora with less than 600 likes have 125 posts each. WWF's total word count for both sub-corpora is 16 805 words while UNICEF has a total of 8 777 words. In this study, the sub-corpora will be referred to as UNICEF 1 (1200 likes), UNICEF 2 (600 likes), WWF 1 (1200 likes) and WWF 2 (600 likes).

3.2 Method

The approach for this study is based on corpus linguistics and discourse analysis. A corpus is defined as "*large bodies of naturally occurring language data stored on computers*" (Baker, 2006, p.1). Corpus tools enable researchers to identify specific core lexical items and how they are used in context.

First the study will identify and determine what communicative function the posts serve using Lovejoy and Saxton's categorization scheme and then the study will move on to analyse common keywords and lexical bundles in order to distinguish linguistic patterns associated with the strategies.

AntConc is used to compare the two corpora with each other. The program is able to list keywords, show word clusters, collocations, and contexts of keywords. In order to find and reveal linguistic patterns in the texts from both organizations, a selection of a few of the most frequent non-topic-related keywords will be analysed using the concordance list in AntConc. 3- and 4-word lexical bundles will be extracted in order to identify common patterns. Keywords analysis and lexical bundles are complementary in many ways. The keywords highlight the propositional content, while lexical bundles frame that content (Gilmore & Millar, 2018).

3.2.1 Lovejoy and Saxton's communication strategies

Lovejoy and Saxton's categorization scheme is used in this study. Although their research focuses on Twitter posts, they argue that the categories are generalizable to other types of social media as well. Several organizations in their study sent out messages on both Twitter and Facebook simultaneously and Facebook posts and tweets are similar in their form and function (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p. 351). One of the main tasks of this study is to analyse the content of organizations' Facebook posts and determine what communicative function they have. After collecting all data, every post was assigned a category from Lovejoy and Saxton's proposed framework. In cases where a post appeared to serve dual purposes, the primary purpose of the message was taken into consideration. For example, a post that includes only information about an event would be put in the informational category. However, if the post also includes date, prize and has a clear promotional purpose, the primary purpose of the post is Action-Promote an event. In this study, the subcategories within Lovejoy and Saxton's three functions of

communication were modified based on the results that emerged during the initial coding of data. A few subcategories occurred rarely in the data and therefore they are not considered in this study. These categories are Responses to republic messages, Selling a product, Call for volunteers and employees and Join another site or vote for the organization. Thus, for this study, the categories are as follows:

Information*:* Posts containing a one-way communication including activities, news, facts, reports or other information relevant to an organization's followers. The information strategy could be seen as a core activity to attract followers (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p.343).

Community: This category has two primary functions, dialogue and community-building and serves to bind and engage the followers. These messages are more interactive than for example the informational posts (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p.343). This category includes three subcategories:

Table 1. Communication strategies - Community

Category	Explanation	Example
1.Giving recognitions and thanks	This category includes giving thanks and recognition to volunteers, sponsors, followers and donors. Acknowledging and thanking donors is essential for nonprofit organizations (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012).	Happy birthday to our Goodwill Ambassador David Beckham. Thanks so much for supporting our work for children around the 🌍.
2.Acknowledgment of local and current events	These messages cover acknowledgement of noteworthy events, including holiday greetings and support of community events. Such posts are an easy way to spark conversation (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012).	Happy World Penguin Day!
3.Response solicitation	These posts solicit a conversational response from stakeholders. For this category, it is clear that organizations are looking to create dialogue. These messages seek response of some sort, including direct questions, requests and polls.	What's the one thing that could always make you smile as a child?

Action: The third category aims to get followers to "do something". With this strategy, organizations want to mobilize followers from informed individuals to members of a community to activists and donors (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p.345). This category includes four sub-categories:

Table 2. Communication strategies – Action

Category	Explanation	Example
1.Promote an event	Messages in this category include not just information about the event but also the date and time. The purpose of these posts is to promote.	In honor of #EarthDay, WWF and @google are teaming up to help students and classrooms code their own Google logo in celebration of wildlife and nature. PS: Don't forget! Earth Day is April 22!
2.Donation appeal	Messages in this category ask either directly for donations or ask people to join the work of the organization.	Water is a right, not a privilege. Agree? Join us, make a donation and help bring clean, safe water to children in Burundi with BeyGOOD and founding supporter Chime for Change.
3.Lobbying and advocacy	In this category, organizations ask followers directly to perform a lobbying- or advocacy-related activity.	People in Belize are celebrating 20 years of the Belize barrier reef being a World Heritage site today! While officials in Belize have agreed to suspend the seismic portion of offshore oil exploration, the reef is still in danger and we need your help to secure its long term protection. Check the link in the comments to email the Belize prime minister now and ask him to save the reef.
4.Learn how to help	This category is different from asking directly for a donation because it sets up a two-step process 1) learn how to help, 2) help.	Find out how you can help protect oceans: https://wwf.to/2tqZIXK

3.2.2 Keyword analysis

A keyword is defined as a word that is unusually frequent in one corpus compared to the frequency of the same word in a different corpus (Baker, 2006, p.125). Keywords represent what makes a corpus unique or different, and they can often provide a clear indication of what a set of texts is about (Gilmore & Millar, 2018, p.5). Keywords can direct the researcher to important concepts in a text in relation to other texts that may help to highlight the existence of types of embedded discourse or ideology. Therefore, keyword analysis is an extremely useful method, paving way for more complex analyses of linguistic patterns (Baker, 2004). The keyness-value presented in this study is calculated by log-likelihood. This means that the frequency of a word is calculated in both the main corpus and in the reference corpus and then the absolute difference between the two frequencies are calculated.

3.2.3 Lexical bundles

Lexical bundles are defined as the most frequent recurring lexical sequences in a register (Biber, Conrad & Cortes, 2004). Lexical bundles are also known as clusters or N-grams. Since this study will focus on communication strategies and linguistic patterns related to those strategies, an analyse of lexical bundles can give a good indication of common patterns. Without access to corpus data, these patterns usually tend to go unnoticed (Gilmore & Millar, 2018). For this study, the most frequent 3- and 4-word clusters were identified using AntConc.

4 Results

4.1 Lovejoy and Saxton's communication strategies

Table 3 below shows the distribution of posts according to Lovejoy and Saxton's communication functions:

Table 3. Communication functions, all posts

Category	UNICEF		WWF	
	Frequency	(%)	Frequency	(%)
Information				
Information	319	85	308	82
Community				
Giving recognitions and thanks	10	2.7	12	3.2
Acknowledgement of local and current events	9	2.4	20	5.3
Response solicitation	21	5.6	9	2.4
Action				
Promote an event	3	0.8	12	3.2
Donation appeal	9	2.4	5	1.3
Lobbying and advocacy	3	0.8	4	1.1
Learn how to help	1	0.3	5	1.3
Total	**375**	**100**	**375**	**100**

The majority of the posts published by the organizations are informative ones. 85 % of UNICEF's posts fall under the category of Information. The second most commonly used strategy for UNICEF is Community (10.7 %), with 5.6 % being Response solicitation. The least popular strategy for UNICEF is Action (4.3 %). Within this category it is Donation appeal that had the highest frequency (2.4 %). The most commonly used strategy for WWF is also Information; 82 % are informative posts. The second most commonly used strategy for WWF is Community (10.9 %). Within the community strategy, it is Acknowledgement of local and current events that predominates (5.3 %). Action is the least used strategy for WWF (6.9 %), with 3.2 % occurring as Promote an event.

4.2 Linguistic patterns

In this part of the study, I look more closely at whether there are any linguistic patterns associated with these strategies. First, the study will look at specific keywords which are commonly used by the organizations. Then, the study will move further into frequently used lexical bundles for each organization and lastly the keywords and lexical bundles will be discussed in association with Lovejoy and Saxton's communication strategies.

4.2.1. Keywords

The keyword analysis showed no remarkable difference between the popular posts and the less popular posts within each organization (see appendix). The result means there may still be a difference, although this is not distinguishable from a keyword analysis. For this section, I will only compare the two larger sub-corpora UNICEF 1 and WWF 1 and the two sub-corpora UNICEF 2 and WWF 2 in the subsequent analysis.

Table 4. Keywords in UNICEF 1 (compared to WWF 1).

Rank	Keyword	Keyness	Rank	Keyword	Keyness
1	emoji	+355.38	7	school	+48.89
2	children	+161.07	8	old	+47.63
3	child	+160.59	9	smile	+44.23
4	every	+94.99	10	baby	+38.94
5	refugee	+67.54	11	girls	+37.24
6	unicef	+51.22	12	her	+35.03

Table 5. Keywords in WWF 1 (compared to UNICEF 1).

Rank	Keyword	Keyness	Rank	Keyword	Keyness
1	the	+102.51	7	news	+25.53
2	wwf	+53.38	8	elephants	+24.78
3	wildlife	+43.59	9	rhino	+22.52
4	wild	+32.3	10	species	+22.52
5	tiger	+26.28	11	and	+22.08
6	conservation	+25.53	12	snow	+21.77

Table 6. Keywords in UNICEF 2 (compared to WWF 2).

Rank	Keyword	Keyness	Rank	Keyword	Keyness
1	emoji	+355.8	7	unicef	+27.64
2	children	+92.43	8	old	+23.95
3	school	+49.81	9	refugee	+22.2
4	I	+33.87	10	her	+22.11
5	violence	+33.18	11	his	+20.26
6	young	+31.33	12	supported	+28.42

Table 7. Keywords in WWF 2 (compared to UNICEF 2).

Rank	Keyword	Keyness
1	climate	+53.06
2	wwf	+52.04
3	the	+26.78
4	https	+26.48
5	river	+24.44
6	forests	+22.4
7	communities	+18.32

All the four tables show many topic-related words such as *children, refugee, wildlife* and *climate* and these words will not be focused on here. The keywords that will be analysed are *emoji, every, smile, news, supported* and *https* because they are less related to the specific field in which the two organizations work and therefore interesting to analyse further. In the next section, I will look closely at how these words are used in the posts.

4.2.2. Keywords in context

As shown in Table 4 and Table 6, emojis are highly frequent in UNICEF compared to WWF. Emojis appear 350 times in total. They are included in a total of 114 posts, meaning at least one emoji appear in 30 % of the posts. WWF has only one post with an emoji. Emotional icons or Emojis, can be described as "*a creative and visually salient way to add expression to an otherwise strictly text-based form*" (Luor, Lu, Wu, & Tao, 2010, p. 890). When a text is without emojis, it may be harder for people to perceive the correct emotion, attitude and attention of the text. When an emoji is added to the text, receivers have been shown to create a more positive attitude towards what is being told (Lo, 2008, p. 597). UNICEF often uses emojis as a way to add extra expressions to the text, especially when they are associated with the topic of the posts as seen in Examples (1) and (2).

> (1) 😲😲😲That face when Sergio Ramos shows up to your football game.

> (2) Sound on 🔊 A child is a child. No matter where they come from or what their migration status.

Emojis occur in posts associated with all strategies. Within these strategies there is no clear pattern regarding *when* and *how* emojis are used. The most used emoji-pattern is one emoji, the second most used is three and the third most use pattern is two emojis. There is a variation of where these emoji are placed. The most common position is in the end of a post, usually a camera emoji referring to the attached picture or a heart at the end of the last sentence. When there is more than one emoji, they occur more frequently in the beginning of the post.

Table 4 shows that the word *every* is included in many posts by UNICEF 1. The word occurs 64 times in their popular posts compared to WWF's 11 posts. The high percentage of posts containing *every* in this sub-corpus is mainly due to the fact that *for every child* is a phrase known and associated with UNICEF. In 45 of these 64 posts, *every* occurs alongside the words

for and *child.* It is a phrase often seen in UNICEF's logos and in various pictures from the organization. This specific phrase always occurs together with a picture of one or more children and a majority of these posts include one or more emojis as in Examples (3) and (4).

(3) 😊😃😄😊For every child, friendship.

(4) For every child, a reason to smile 😄💙.

For every child occurs in the strategies of both Information and Community. In 42 posts the phrase is associated with the strategy of Information and in three posts the main goal is to solicit a conversational response from stakeholders. The three posts associated with the strategy of Community are categorized as Response solicitation. Organizations can use Facebook to interact with stakeholders in a way that facilitates the creation of an online community, as in Examples (5) and (6).

(5) Fill in the blank! My wish for every child is _____.

(6) 😃 😃 😃Tag a friend who makes you smile this much! For every child, happiness!

Table 4 shows that *smile* occurs more frequently in UNICEF 1 compared to WWF 1. The word occurs 20 times in the former and zero times in the latter.

Smile is a word appearing in many informational posts. In 13 posts, the word is included in an informational context whereas in three posts *smile* is included in the category of Community, more specifically Response solicitation. In the posts containing Response solicitation *smile* always occurs with the personal pronoun *you* as in Examples (7), (8) and (9). These messages seek response of some sort from the followers.

(7) ❤️💛💚💙💜 How do you say smile in your language?

(8) What's the one thing that could always make you smile as a child?

(9) 😃 😃 😃Tag a friend who makes you smile this much! For every child, happiness!

In three of the informational posts, the pattern *smile* occurs alongside *like everyone is watching* as seen in Examples (10), (11) and (12). In two of these posts, the pattern *for every child* is also included.

(10)   Smile like everyone is watching! ❤️

(11)   Smile like everyone is watching! For every child, ❤️

(12)   Smile like everyone is watching! For every child, 😄.

As shown in Table 5, *news* occurs more frequently in WWF 1 compared to UNICEF 1. *News* is included in 34 posts by WWF 1 while UNICEF 1 has zero posts containing the word *news*. This word is also included in the Information strategy. In line with previous research, these posts involve a one-way interaction, an exchange of information from the organization to the public. The majority of these messages are positive, sharing hopeful news to the reader, as in Examples (13) and (14).

> (13)   Good news: Six newborn tiger cubs were recorded during a recent wildlife survey in Thailand.

> (14)   Did you miss this good news? The Belize Barrier Reef World Heritage site is now off UNESCO's in danger list!

Table 6 shows that the keyword *supported* occurs more frequently in UNICEF 2 compared to WWF 2. *Supported* is included in 10 posts by UNICEF 2 while WWF 2 has zero posts containing the word *supported*. UNICEF's use of the word *supported* also shows an informative pattern, providing information about the organization's activities in different countries. The reader receives information about the progress that UNICEF makes in their work towards creating a better world for children. When organizations give detailed information on its activities, it can connect a broad array of stakeholders to its goal and help to boost accountability and trust (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p.343).

> (15)   Thanks to a new UNICEF-supported water project, Ismail's dream of an education in Somaliland is finally becoming true.

> (16)   "I love jumping rope, drawing pictures and playing the tambourine," says Asia, 10, from a UNICEF-supported child friendly space at a camp in Bangladesh.

> (17)   Little Haiapi gets a check-up at a UNICEF-supported hospital.

In Table 7 it shows that *https* is used more frequently in WWF 2 compared to UNICEF 2. WWF 2 has a total of 31 posts including a hyperlink to another site in their less popular, compared to two in UNICEF 2. For these posts, WWF shares information and news to the reader. A large proportion of posts by WWF include links to other sites where additional facts could be found. Sharing links can get followers interested in a story in the same way newspapers use headlines. By providing an additional link, followers can choose if they want to continue reading (Lovejoy, Waters & Saxton, 2012, p.4). These messages are associated with the category of Information. The main difference between this category and the others is that these messages primary purpose is solely to inform; there is no explicit secondary agenda.

> (18)   Finding a partner in the wild isn't always easy. Blue-footed boobies, for instance, rely on flashing their bright blue, webbed feet to attract a female. Learn more: about finding love in the wild: https://wwf.to/2SKidVR

(19)　　　　　Happy International Red Panda Day! Did you know that red pandas are just slightly larger than a domestic cat? These forest dwellers use their bushy tails to help keep balance as they navigate through trees. They feed mainly on leaves and bamboo, but occasionally snack on fruit, insects, bird eggs, and small lizards, too. Learn more about them: https://wwf.to/2NMEq3a

4.2.3. Lexical bundles

This section will now look at a few patterns in terms of lexical bundles. Given the fact that lexical bundles are defined strictly on the basis of frequency, they will give a useful insight into the language patterns often used by the organizations. For this analysis, the total number of posts are included for both corpora.

Table 9. 3-word lexical bundles in UNICEF 1 and UNICEF 2.

Rank	Frequency	Range	N-gram
1	175	28	emoji emoji emoji
2	46	45	for every child
3	14	14	a unicef supported

Table 10. 3-word lexical bundles in WWF 1 and WWF 2.

Rank	Frequency	Range	N-gram
1	26	24	one of the
2	21	21	learn more https
3	17	17	did you know

Table 11. 4-word lexical bundles in UNICEF 1 and UNICEF 2.

Rank	Frequency	Range	N-gram
1	146	12	emoji emoji emoji emoji
2	9	9	at a unicef supported
3	9	5	end violence in schools

Table 12. 4-word lexical bundles in WWF 1 and WWF 2.

Rank	Frequency	Range	N-gram
1	20	20	learn more https wwf
2	9	9	in the fight to
3	9	9	one of the most

As discussed in previous section and shown in Table 9, the word *every* occurs alongside *for* and *child* frequently (45 post). The lexical bundle analysis shows that, in the majority of posts the phrase is followed by a noun like *friendship, education, dreams, freedom, health, happiness* and *joy*. For example, the words: *for every child, friendship* appears in six different posts. As previously mentioned, the phrase occurs in a majority of informational posts but also a few posts with a community-building purpose. The figure below shows common patterns related to *for every child*.

Figure 1. Instances of *for every child* in UNICEF 1 and UNICEF 2.

The results in Tables 10 and 12, show that additional links often occur together with the phrase *learn more*. The results also show that the links refer back to WWF's own webpage as seen below:

Figure 2. Instances of *learn more* in WWF 1 and WWF 2.

This pattern is always used in informational posts. No posts with the strategy of Community or Action included this phrase.

The word *supported* also occurs in a lexical bundle. As seen in the Table 9, a *unicef-supported* is among the highest frequent patterns.

Figure 3. Instances of *unicef-supported* in UNICEF 1 and UNICEF 2.

Hit	KWIC
1	e tambourine," says Asia, 10, from a UNICEF-supported child friendly spa
2	Rozina regularly takes the boys to a UNICEF-supported community clinic
3	being screened for malnutrition at a UNICEF-supported health centre in H
4	Haiapi gets a check-up at a UNICEF-supported hospital. His fam
5	hnique known as kangaroo care at a UNICEF-supported hospital in Cote d
6	loving mother holds her tight at a UNICEF-supported nutrition centre ir
7	a tasty bowl of porridge at a UNICEF-supported nutrition class in
8	ohammad, 3 days old, was born in a UNICEF-supported pediatric ward in
9	Rimas on her first day at a UNICEF-supported school in Za'atari
10	We're at a UNICEF-supported school in Iraq, wi
11	d playing with his friends outside a > UNICEF-supported school in Guinea-
12	us a picture she drew at a UNICEF-supported shelter for displa
13	hool. The project was organised by a UNICEF-supported student-led club
14	ool in Guinea-Bissau. Thanks to the UNICEF-supported training his teach
15	little monsters are all smiles at a UNICEF-supported water point in Ka
16	go to school." Thanks to a new UNICEF-supported water project, Isr

The lexical bundle analysis reveals that the word *supported* never occurs alone. Instead, it is imbedded with the name of the organization itself, followed by a noun like *hospital, school, health centre.* In nine of these posts, the pattern begins with the preposition *at. At a unicef-supported* is the second most frequent 4-lexical bundle. The pattern *unicef-supported* is common in informational posts were UNICEF wants to highlight the work made by the organization in different countries. These posts are always positive, showing an expression of happiness and gratitude. This is shown by the use of words like *thanks to the/thanks to a new/ happy/friendly/love/smile/warm* in connection to the pattern.

The lexical bundle of *did you know* is quite interesting to look at further. This pattern is a common feature in 'fact' posts given by WWF. In order to get people to react and perceive the information, *did you know* can work as a good eye catcher to get people engaged in the information given. These messages include the pronoun *you* which addresses the reader of the text and make the reader feel included. The personal pronoun *you* signal familiarity and trust between the sender and the recipient (Hellspong & Ledin, 1997, p.173).

Figure 4. Instances of *did you know* in WWF 1 and WWF 2.

Hit	KWIC
1	Did you know Brazil nuts are produced in Bolivia, where Acai berries
2	Did you know by purchasing paper, greeting cards, and other desk supplie
3	Did you know? Scientists estimate more than 2 million species live in ocean
4	Did you know shrimp cocktails can impact sea turtles? Sea turtles are
5	did you know that shark attacks are extremely rare? In fact, there
6	Did you know that red pandas are just slightly larger than a
7	Did you know that a key ingredient in pesto also plays a
8	Did you know that penguins have flippers instead of wings? They spend
9	Did you know that narwhals change color as they age? Newborns are
10	Did you know that elephants have a dominant tusk? They can either
11	Did you know that less than 1% of water is fresh and available
12	Did you know the Amazon contains one in ten known species on
13	did you know the food we eat during the holidays can impact
14	Did you know tiger stripes are unique to each tiger and—like
15	Did you know today is World Heritage Day? Take a look at
16	Did you know warming temperatures are turning sea turtle populations in t
17	Did you know we lose and waste 1.3 billion tons of food each

As previous mentioned, an analysis of lexical bundles is a great complement to the analysis of keywords. This analysis shows that there are some patterns related to the most frequent keywords. However, no pattern was found to be the same for both organizations. A larger amount of data and more organizations may have shown more similarities. It is possible to say that there are a few linguistic patterns associated with communication strategies used by these organizations. However, they may not necessarily be associated with only one specific strategy.

5 Discussion and conclusion

The advent of social media has given nonprofit organizations an opportunity to engender a more active and interactive community. This study has examined two large organizations' Facebook utilization in order to find out what communication strategies nonprofit organizations tend to use in their social media communication. This study aimed to accomplish two main tasks. First the study identified and determined what communicative function the posts served and then the study moved on to analyse common keywords and lexical bundles in order to distinguish linguistic patterns associated with the strategies.

The majority of the messages produced by the organizations are information based. 85 % of the posts by UNICEF are informational. Merely 10.7 % of the post by UNICEF are community building and the rest, just over 4 %, encourage an action. WWF has a similar result regarding the Information category. About 82 % of the posts are informational. 10.9 % are community-building. They have a somewhat larger number of posts containing the Action strategy (6.9 %.) In line with previous research (Saxton & Waters, 2014 & Waters and Jamal, 2011), the current study's results show that the organizations mainly publish information as a one-way communication, while they use less of the community building functions. Previous research has suggested that nonprofit organizations do not live up to the dialogic potential of social media. Lovejoy and Saxton predict that informational posts will continue to be the "base" form of communication and that dialogue will simply be one essential piece in their communication (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012, p. 349). In the current study, both Facebook pages seem to use Information as a core function to attract followers. First, they may need to inform the public about why there is a need for their work, prior to attempting to build a community and eventually mobilize their followers to take action. The results of the study showed no remarkable different between the two organizations regarding communication strategies. The most distinct differences were found in the categories of Response solicitation and Acknowledgement of local and current events. UNICEF asks more direct questions while WWF tends to acknowledge noteworthy events and holiday greetings more frequently.

Some differences were found when analysing linguistic patterns. Emojis are a feature often used by UNICEF to add extra emotions to the texts. The emojis are often related to the topic of the message, making it easier to perceive the correct emotion of the message. UNICEF uses the phrase *for every child* in posts containing information and messages that are community building. *For every child* is a known phrase often used by UNICEF in other communication settings. This study shows that this is also the case regarding their Facebook

communication. The lexical bundle analysis showed that the word *supported* occurred together with the word UNICEF which created one of the most frequent patterns of *(at a) unicef-supported.* WWF often adds a hyperlink to an additional webpage in their informational posts, something Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) also found to be used often by organizations. These posts also contained the phrase *learn more* which is one of the most commonly used lexical bundles for WWF. *Did you know* is another pattern used by WWF in posts conveying one-way communication with an aim to give facts to their followers. *Learn more, did you know* and *unicef-supported* were the only patterns to be associated with only one communication strategy, Information.

Previous studies have focused on the organizational side of messages and what strategies are used most frequently while this study partly focused on linguistic patterns connected to these strategies. The results from the present study cannot be generalized since it was a small set of data. In the future it would be interesting to conduct a similar study with more data and a larger number of nonprofit organizations within different fields to find out if the findings would be similar. It would also be interesting to analyse whether nonprofit organizations use social media differently in other countries. Furthermore, this study did not look at comments from the followers something a future study could investigate in. What comments are posted in association to interactive posts versus informational posts? An additional direction for future study could be to examine differences and similarities between different social media platforms. Do the organizations use the same interaction and language on all platforms or not?

References

Baker, P. (2004). Querying keywords: Questions of difference, frequency, and sense in keywords analysis. *Journal of English Linguistics*, *32*(4), 346-359.

Baker, P. (2006). *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Barnes, N. G., & Andonian, J. (2011). The 2011 Fortune 500 and social media adoption: Have America's largest companies reached a social media plateau. University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth. Retrieved March 21, 2019, from www. umassd. edu/cmr/studiesandresearch/bloggingtwitterandfacebookusage

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at…: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. *Applied linguistics*, *25*(3), 371-405.

Cho, M., Schweickart, T., & Haase, A. (2014). Public engagement with nonprofit organizations on Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, 40(3), 565-567.

Gilmore, A., & Millar, N. (2018). The language of civil engineering research articles: A corpus-based approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, *51*, 1-17.

Guo, C., & Saxton, G. D. (2014). Tweeting social change: How social media are changing nonprofit advocacy. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *43*(1), 57-79.

Hellspong, L. & Ledin, P. (1997). *Vägar genom texten: handbok i brukstextanalys*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Lo, S. (2008). The nonverbal communication functions of emoticons in computer-mediated communication. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11(5), 595–597.

Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. (2012). Information, community, and action: How Nonprofit Organizations Use Social Media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(3), 337-353.

Lovejoy, K., Waters, R. D., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Engaging stakeholders through Twitter: How nonprofit organizations are getting more out of 140 characters or less. *Public Relations Review*, *38*, 313-318.

Luor, T. T., Wu, L. L., Lu, H. P., & Tao, Y. H. (2010). The effect of emoticons in simplex and complex task-oriented communication: An empirical study of instant messaging. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 889-895.

Saxton, G. D., & Waters, R. D. (2014). What do stakeholders like on Facebook? Examining public reactions to nonprofit organizations' informational, promotional, and community-building messages. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *26*(3), 280-299.

Waters, R. D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., & Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public relations review*, *35*(2), 102-106.

Waters, R. D., & Jamal, J. Y. (2011). Tweet, tweet, tweet: A content analysis of nonprofit organizations' Twitter updates. *Public Relations Review*, *37*(3), 321-324.

Electronic sources

Unicef. (2009). In Facebook [Group page]. Retrieved March 20, 2019, from https://www.facebook.com/unicef/

Worldwildlifefund. [ca. 2008]. In Facebook [Group page]. Retrieved March 20, 2019, from https://www.facebook.com/worldwildlifefund/

Appendix A

Frequent words UNICEF more than 1200 likes compared to UNICEF less than 600 likes.

Keyword Types:	3		Keyword Tokens:	161	Search Hits:	0
Rank	**Freq**	**Keyness**	**Effect**	**Keyword**		
1	74	+ 32.63	0.0281	child		
2	65	+ 30.21	0.0247	every		
3	22	+ 16.86	0.0085	baby		

Appendix B

Frequent words UNICEF less than 600 likes
compared to UNICEF more than 1200 likes.

Keyword Types:	1		Keyword Tokens:	190	Search Hits:	0
Rank	Freq	Keyness	Effect		Keyword	
1	190	+ 25.78	0.0959		emoji	

Appendix C

Frequent words WWF more than 1200 likes
compared to WWF less than 600 likes.

Keyword Types:	2		Keyword Tokens:	59	Search Hits:	0
Rank	Freq	Keyness	Effect		Keyword	
1	30	+ 23.57	0.0053		rhino	
2	29	+ 22.78	0.0051		snow	

Appendix D

Frequent words WWF less than 600 likes compared to WWF more than 1200 likes.

Keyword Types:	7	Keyword Tokens:	166	Search Hits:	0
Rank	**Freq**	**Keyness**	**Effect**	**Keyword**	
1	22	+ 27.61	0.008	water	
2	15	+ 27.09	0.0055	rivers	
3	12	+ 27.03	0.0044	flowing	
4	26	+ 25.73	0.0095	https	
5	52	+ 25.38	0.0188	climate	
6	15	+ 23.04	0.0055	free	
7	24	+ 22.45	0.0087	river	