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Abstract
I vores moderne samfund har den teknologiske revolution ændret verden og påvirket den måde, vi som aktører interagerer og lever på tværs af tid og rum (Castells, 2000). Denne proces er defineret af to logikker; the logic of collective action og the logic of connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). The logic of collective action er defineret ved stærkere koblinger, mere formel organisatorisk styring og skabelsen af en kollektiv identitet. The logic of connective action er et udtryk for den måde medierende teknologier har påvirket verden og skabt mulighed for at aktører kan organisere sig selv i omfattende og løst kobledes netværk, og derved engagerere sig i digitally networked action (DNA), organisert gennem teknologi. Formålet med dette studie er at undersøge hvordan disse organisatoriske dynamikker kan identificeres i Twitter-interaktioner der finder sted i online social movements, og hvordan disse dynamikker påvirker engagement i, og deltagelsen i co-creation af online communities.


Studiet identificerer at aktører, der tager del i disse online social movements, er selv-organiserende gennem DNA, baseret på teknologiske affordances (fx et hashtag), og derved udnytter teknologien som den organiserende agent af interaktioner i disse omfattende, løst-kobledes dynamiske netværk. På baggrund af sociale mediers natur og den måde de bliver brugt er personalized action frames (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012) og den frivillige selv-motiverende deling af indhold, og hvorvidt denne handling er gengældt, en integreret del af disse online movements og har stor indflydelse på deres rækkevidde og indvirkning. På samme tid kan det identificeres at aktører engagerer sig i synergistisk co-creation af dynamiske communities og derigennem arbejder mod at skabe et fælles mål med den hensigt at opnå sociale forandringer. Dette medfører at de fornævnte personalized action frames bliver artikuleret til collective action frames, der på trods af disse communities dynamiske og løst-kobledes natur skaber en kollektiv identitet gennem kontinuerlige interaktioner. Disse interaktioner fører også til co-creation af fælles forståelser der konstituerer disse communities.
På baggrund af disse opdagelser præsenteres en model, der afspejler hvordan de to organisations dynamikker er afspejlet i de sociale medie interaktioner der finder sted i online social movements, og hvordan disse påvirker engagement og deltagelse i co-creation af online communities.
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**Part 1: Introduction**

The following part contains an introduction to the thesis and presents the research question and its relevance.

**1.1 Introduction**

In modern society the technological revolution has changed the world and created a digital landscape where individuals live and interact across time and space (Castells, 2000). In this hyper polarized and fragmented digitalized world (Briggs & Burke, 2010; Dahlberg, 2007), individuals create networks through interactions based on communication technologies defined by the idea of a *network society* (Castells, 2000) constituted by the *technological paradigm* (Castells, 2000). In this *network society*, actors define themselves through various interactions, and engage in the creation of shared understandings in order to navigate in the digital landscape. These shared understandings are co-created through social media interactions (Luo, Zhang & Liu, 2015), which potentially leads to the mobilization of actors drawn together by shared beliefs and values and thus mediates solidarity between fragmented actors (Fenton, 2008).

It is therefore interesting how the internet has become a platform, where actors can interact and engage in political activism, and through mediated activity seek to raise awareness and ultimately seek social change (Fenton, 2008). This led to the emergence of *digitally networked action* (DNA) by Bennett & Segerberg (2012) and the emergence of New Social Movements (NSMs) (Fenton, 2008). DNA is often found in large-scale fluid and weak-tied networks wherein actors interact and engage in co-creation of shared understandings. In these networks mediating solidarity is more important in the process of forging communities than simply providing information (Fenton, 2008).

This is also reflected in how actors, hungry for a sense of connection, interact and engage in co-creation of these communities (Fournier & Lee, 2009) in an attempt to make sense of the world by comparing their perception with others (Brass, Galaskiewicz, Greve & Tsai, 2004). The emergence of DNA, and thereby co-creating online communities, is dependent on the interactions between actors on social media (Yates & Pacuette, 2011), and the formation of ties that these interactions entail (Seraj, 2012; Piller, Vossen & Ihl, 2012; Miller & Lammas 2010).

The technological revolution is therefore enabling actors to mobilize and potentially seek social change through digitally networked action (DNA) (Bennet & Segerberg, 2012). However there is a gap in knowledge between how technology has influenced the way actors interact in networks and mobilize movements and how these interactions enable actors to engage in co-creating shared understandings that constitutes online communities. This study seeks to investigate the
organizational dynamics that define the interactions found in NSMs and how these influence the engagement with and co-creation of online communities by studying by analyzing Twitter interactions (tweets) from key periods of three different NSMs:

- #YesAllWomen
- Black Lives Matter
- ALS Ice Bucket Challenge

These NSMs illustrate how mediating technologies can be used to reach millions of actors and generate millions of interactions between actors interacting and co-creating in large-scale fluid networks. These movements also illustrate how social media can be utilized as an organizing agent, and how DNA can seek to achieve social change.

1.2 Research question

These NSMs are studied by focusing on two organizational dynamics; the logic of collective action and the logic of connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). The logic of collective action is defined by formal organizational control, stronger commitment and collective identity framing. The logic of connective action is a result of mediating technologies especially web 2.0 that inspire and affords emergent digitally networked action, based on large-scale self-organized, fluid and weak-tied networks (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). The emerging argument is that the technological revolution and new media inspires more emergent digitally networked action, and that the logic of connective action is the most developed model of how these new media are impacting the logic of collective action (Wright, 2015).

The thesis will therefore investigate how these two logics of action are reflected in the chosen NSMs by analyzing interactions between actors and identifying how they influence the co-creation of online communities. This is done by answering the following research question:

- How are the logics of collective and connective action reflected in Twitter interactions and how do these define the engagement with and co-creation of shared understandings that constitute online communities?

1.2.1 Purpose and Relevance

The overall purpose of the thesis is to close the gap between articles that identify how the technological revolution and mediating technologies influence the way a fragmented crowd of actors interact and organize, and articles that identify how mediating technologies, especially
social media, have had an impact on the way actors engage in co-creation of online communities. The thesis seeks to deepen the understanding of how and why actors engage in online co-creation, and what defines the NSMs that achieve some level of social change.

1.3 Thesis structure
This thesis consists of six parts:

1. **Introduction** provides an introduction to the thesis and presents the research question
2. **Literature review** contains the theoretical baseline and presents the used theories and models
3. **Methodology** describes the used methods and how the collected data is analyzed
4. **Findings and analysis** presents relevant findings and contains the analysis of the cases
5. **Discussion** compares the findings from the different cases and presents a new framework
6. **Conclusion** articulate the findings, present the conclusions and the theoretical as well as practical implications

Part 2: Literature review
The following part contains the theoretical baseline for the entire thesis, the *theory of science* and the literature review describing the relevant and used theories and models. This part will first discuss *theory of science*, identifying how the world and knowledge is perceived and then identify the main theoretical concepts; *The logics of action, Interactions* and *Ties* and finally define the concept *online community*.

2.1 Philosophy of science

2.1.1 The network perspective

2.1.1.1 Ontology
Ontology is fundamentally about answering the question: “What is the world really made of?” (Moses & Knutsen, 2012 p. 4). The ontological perspective of this thesis takes outset in the network perspective defined by Castells in the idea of a network society (2000), as well as the Actor-Network-Theory (ANT) as defined by Latour (2010) and Law (1992), thereby answering the fundamental ontological question with: *networks*. ANT is relevant by seeing society as a heterogenous network (Law, 1992), constructed by all kinds of actors. These networks are created through a continuous interweaving of human and non-human actors in different nodes and


connections (Olesen & Kroustrup, 2007). Castells network society is fundamental in how it describes all processes as enacted by structures that are built upon information networks, which is a set of interconnected nodes (Castells, 2000). The strength of networks lies in their flexibility and fluidity, they are often de-centralized, and by definition a network has no centre (Castells, 2000). These networks are made from the conflictive interaction between actors organized in and around a given social structure (Castells, 2000). This social structure creates a frame for actors, through which meaning is constantly produced and reproduced through symbolic interactions between actors (Castells, 2000). The thesis will employ a constructivistic perspective to study how actors are structured and interact in networks and analyze how these actors construct meaning. However, seeing how these networks are created by heterogeneous materials, the constructivistic is not sufficient, as ANT denies the potential for pure social relations. This constructivistic perspective therefore includes materialism in order to understand the world, and is thereby defined by both materialism and constructivism at the same time (Oleson & Kroustrup, 2007).

The social structures are constantly challenged and ultimately transformed by deliberate social action (Castells, 2000), however as networks, any new input can theoretically be added to the network, and social change is therefore difficult. This does however take place, and one of the catalysts is other networks built around alternative projects, which compete from network to network, to build bridges to other networks in society (Castells, 2000). Societies are defined by constructing a public space in which private interests and projects can be negotiated to reach an always unstable point of shared decision making toward a common good within a historically given social boundary (Castells, 2007)

It is worth noting that ANT is concerned with the mechanics of power and how power is generated. This poses a challenge seeing that the impact of power will not be studied in the thesis. The relevance of ANT can therefore be questioned, but seeing how ANT is more interested in the establishment of networks than their later dynamics (Couldry, 2008), ANT will be applied to understand the underlying structures and formation of networks, and not the impact and potential of the networks that are created.

2.1.1.2 Epistemology
Another important theoretical distinction is to define the epistemological perspective. Fundamentally epistemology is about answering the question: "What is knowledge?" (Moses & Knutsen, 2012 p. 4). In a networks perspective, the heterogeneous networks (Law, 1992) are crucial, as knowledge may be seen as a product or effect of these networks of heterogeneous
Knowledge is seen as a juxtapose of social, technical, conceptual and textual pieces combined in the network. Knowledge is seen as what Nonaka (1994; Nonaka Toyama & Konno, 2000) describes as a contextual, justified true belief (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka et al., 2000).

Knowledge is seen as contextually created by interpreting the flow of information in the relation to the particular time and space (Nonaka et al., 2000), or in other words “to understand why things are happening” (Aspers, 2006 p. 757). The context of knowledge creation, the Ba (Nonaka et al., 2000), is therefore the foundation for interpreting information in order to create knowledge. This also implies that knowledge loses meaning outside of the original context making it difficult to transfer (Schneckenberg, 2009).

Knowledge is seen as a justified true belief (Nonaka et al., 2000), as the process of knowledge creation entails interpretation of information by individuals in a given context, anchored in personal values and beliefs, thus emphasizing ‘justified’. Therefore there is no such thing as an objective truth seeing that knowledge will always be interpreted and re-interpreted in the context. This pursuit of objectivity is also transformed seeing how individuals in a network society simultaneously are portrayed in the world and inside their networks (Latour, 2010). Following Castells concept of network society, this definition of knowledge implies that we have entered a new technological paradigm (Castells, 2000).

2.1.2 The technological paradigm

This new paradigm is defined by the use of knowledge-based information technologies to enhance and accelerate the production of knowledge and information, in a self-expanding virtuous circle (Castells, 2000). Castells argues that this impact on the production of knowledge and information is at the source of life, and everything is therefore transformed, creating the aforementioned network society (Castells, 2000).

In this new technological paradigm constituted by the network society there are two emergent forms of time and space; timeless time and space of flows (Castells, 2000). These emergent forms are especially seen on social media, as timeless time argues that these new information and communication technologies attempt to annihilate time, seeing that time is compressed and everything can happen in a matter of seconds while at the same time appearing as de-sequenced and asynchronous (Castells, 2000). The space of flows argues that individuals are organizing and interacting simultaneously across social practices without geographical contiguity (Castells, 2000), which is clearly identified on social media. In a network perspective, this technological revolution
dissolves entirely the individual versus society conundrum (Latour, 2010) This does not mean that there is no society and only individuals, but that the two notions are the two faces of the same coin (Latour, 2010), as individuals constitute themselves through co-creation in social interactions. Every individual is part of a matrix whose lines and columns are made of the others as well (Latour, 2010). Actors in these networks are articulated by complex and ever-evolving relationships based on adaption, interdependence and simultaneous concentrations and diffusions of power (Wright, 2015).

The impact of the technological revolution is therefore undeniable, however when utilizing both ANT and Castells theories, it is important to distinguish the role of the social and technical. Castells argues that: “Technology is embodied in technical relationships, which are socially conditioned, so in itself it is not an independent, non-human dimension” (Castells, 2000 p. 8). This definition shares some similarities with ANT that denies the potential of purely social or technical relations (Tatnall & Gilding, 1999), and argues that networks are not only composed of people, but also of all kinds of materials, the social is therefore in an ANT perspective seen as “nothing other than patterned networks of heterogeneous materials” (Law, 1992 p. 381). Technology is therefore throughout the thesis seen as an actor in the networks, and the influence of technology is explicit in their defining mediating ability. By arguing that the networks can be seen as heterogeneous entities, the question of social versus technical is avoided, and instead the relevant discussion is the strength of the association (strong vs weak) (Latour, 2010).

An important note is that it is not the actors themselves that are the main study object of the thesis; but the dynamics of interactions, the strength of their relations (tie creation) and how these interactions entail the creation of communities. The network perspective is therefore used as a framework for understanding and studying the underlying structures that define the dynamics of interactions. ANT is used based on its concern with how actors and organizations mobilize, juxtapose and hold together the bits and pieces of which they are composed (Law, 1992).

### 2.2 The Logics of Action

The logics of collective and connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012) are fundamental logics for understanding how actors organize and mobilize in networks and co-create communities through interactions. It is therefore crucial to gain an understanding of how these logics of action define the process where individuals interact and mobilize in NSMs with the intention of achieving social change. As argued in the philosophy of science-section the technological paradigm has an immense impact on the world and the creation of social structures, as well as the creation of the
connective structures that the two logics are based on (Lim, 2013). The use of these information based communication technologies is crucial in digitally enabling the creation of networks. Some of these networks are formally influenced by organizations, while others are self-organizing and emerging digitally through personalized action frames using technology as the organizing agent. This has led to the emergence of DNA (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). The emergence of DNA reflects a potential shift from the organizational dynamic of collective action, as the creation of collective identities is challenged by these new communication technologies that have facilitated these large, weak-tied, decentralized and often leaderless networks defined by participation rather than the hierarchical model of traditional politics (Fenton, 2008; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012; Granovetter, 1983). The impact of digital media and web 2.0 is therefore crucial seeing how it enables and mediates the creation and communication of personalized content (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), often referred to as memes, which is a symbolic package, easily transferred, imitated, adapted and open for interpretation by others. However, in order to understand how the logics of action are reflected in social media interactions, there is a need to identify the key elements that defines them, as well as where they differentiate.

2.2.1 The logic of collective action

The logic of collective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012; Olson, 1965) is defined by a more formal organizational coordination, and “typically requires people to make more difficult choices and adopt more self-changing social identities” (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012 p. 748). Collective action often requires a stronger commitment by the individual, and will often result in collective identity framing (Lim, 2013; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), based on a set of values and symbols specific to that group (Lim, 2013). These groups are often defined by some sort of boundary, which simply might be the required commitment or the somewhat restricted access (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Collective action typically involves seeking some sort of public good by collectively forging a common cause (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Networks that reflect this logic of collective action tend to be characterized by distinct groups, networking to bring members and affiliated groups into action and keep them there (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012).

Collective action can for example be identified in the Tunisian uprising (Lim, 2013), which was sparked by an individual, Mohamed Bouazizi, that set himself on fire, where individuals identified themselves with the shared narrative and the collective identity which led to participation and action by reproducing the protests (Lim, 2013). This illustrates how the shared collective identity can lead to a stronger commitment and stronger ties between actors, inspiring the engaged individuals to take action.
There is however an often discussed issue; that rational, self-interested individuals will not act to achieve their common or group interest, and that individuals and will “free ride”, to reap the benefits of the good without contributing (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012; Wright, 2015). Extensive research however argues that individuals voluntary organize themselves and contribute more than expected, with the purpose of gaining collective benefits, as the willingness to contribute is strongly correlated with the expected behaviors of others (Ostrom, 1999). It is however important to keep in mind, that some groups do and some groups do not succeed in overcoming social dilemmas to achieve collective action, and simply assuming that humans adopt social norms does not eliminate the problem of “free riders” in collective action (Ostrom, 1999).

2.2.2 The logic of connective action

The logic of connective action is defined by individuals that seek more personalized ways to engage in actions and use of these information technologies and engage in digitally networked action (Bennett & Segeberg, 2012). The logic of connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012) “applies increasingly to life in modern societies in which formal organizations are losing their grip on individuals, and group ties are being replaced by large-scale fluid networks” (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012 p. 748), which also is the argument of Castells (2000) and Fenton that argues how NSMs are more fluid and informal networks of action (Fenton, 2008). This logic of connective action is often based on personal action frames, and does not to the same extend require a strong commitment or the construction of a united ‘we’ (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). It has been argued that; “Connective action is arguably the most developed and detailed theoretical model of how new media are impacting the logic of collective action” (Wright, 2015 p. 424), reflecting how digital media is at the core of this logic, acting as organizing agents (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Connective action is especially enabled by the technological revolution, in particular Web 2.0 and social media (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), seeing that the mediating technologies lead to more network building and casual weak-tied connections between like-minded individuals (Lou et al., 2015; Fenton, 2008), without formal ties or commitment to organizations or other groups (Cristancho & Anduiza, 2013; Chadwick, 2007). Connective action is defined by actors in networks that self-organize without central or leading organizational actors, as technologies serve as an organizational agent (Cristancho & Anduiza, 2013; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), allowing a shift from “organizations organizing” to more individual organizing (Wright, 2015; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), where it is more important to be networked individuals than embedded in groups (Wright, 2015).
This is made possible in these digital networks where the process of participation is self-motivating, as the personally expressive content, is shared and recognized by others, who in turn, reciprocate these network sharing activities, which result in the process of co-creation and sharing based on *personalized action frames* (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). This *act of sharing* is the linchpin of connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Connective action is therefore defined by more individualized and personalized content, *memes*, which easily can be shared over digital networks allowing connective action to become an organizational form of political action (Wright, 2015; Lim, 2013; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), where the political content easily can be personalized. This easily transferable and customizable content communicates a message that is sufficiently open to interpretation and thus allowing a wide group of individuals to support and adapt it to different reasons and concerns (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012; Cristancho & Anduiza, 2013; Lim, 2013; Wright, 2015). This also differentiates connective from collective action seeing that collective action more often faces challenges with transferring communicative content into new contexts, and potentially reach barriers defined by different values (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012).

Another aspect is that the reciprocation of these network sharing activities becomes an act of personal expression and self-validation by contributing to a common good and acting as legitimization processes (Cristancho & Anduiza, 2013; Lim, 2013; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). That was also seen in the case of the Tunisian uprising (Lim, 2013), where individuals around the world "connected" with the narrative being shared through social media and thus, while being geographically distant did not physically join the protests, but helped globalize the movements and drew international support, which sustained the uprising and gave voice and power to the Tunisian people (Lim, 2013). This is the result of online social network connections substituting the more traditional organizational mobilization processes, distinguishing DNA from traditionally collective action (TCA) (Cristancho & Anduiza, 2013). This is also seen in how Cristancó & Anduiza identify DNA by a large proportion of participants being mobilized mainly by online social media, and the lack of staging organizations (Cristancho & Anduiza, 2013) reflecting the notion that technologies in connective action must be identified as relevant actors in the networks.
2.2.2.1 Framework 1: Differences between the logics of collective and connective action (Author’s own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework 1</th>
<th>Collective action - networks defined by formal organizations</th>
<th>Connective action - self organizing networks (digitally networked action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Strong formal organizational coordination</td>
<td>Self-organizing without central leadership - technology is the organizing agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Stronger ties between actors</td>
<td>More important for individuals to be part of weak tied networks than embedded in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>Collectively seeking public good by forging a common cause</td>
<td>Participation is self-motivating, the act of sharing as well as recognizing and reciprocating the shared content is integral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity framing</strong></td>
<td>Stronger commitment through collective identity framing based on a set of values and symbols specific to the group</td>
<td>No construction of a united &quot;we&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary</strong></td>
<td>Defined by some sort of boundary for example the commitment or some sort of restricted access</td>
<td>Unrestricted network access where group ties are being replaces by large-scale fluid networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicative content</strong></td>
<td>Collective action frames based on the collective identity framing</td>
<td>Personalized action frames - often communicated through memes that are easily transferable and open for interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3 The hybrid

The idea of a hybrid between the two logics is further interesting, reflecting Bennett & Segerberg’s (2012) argument, that organizational structures are rarely based on either archetype, but instead
formed by a hybrid of the two. This is based in the argument that the technological revolution increasingly has enabled the construction of organization-less groups, in which individuals construct their own interest-based collectives, and the creation of blogs or personal web sites are common, as we are seeing a shift from organizations organizing to more solo organizers or “lone wolves” and “parties of one” as Wright (2015) identifies them. This illustrates the self-organizing nature of connective action, but these organization-less groups might still require strong commitment or reflect some sort of collective identity framing, thus illustrating elements of collective action. This form of organizing that is emerging through mediating technologies reflects many different elements as it attempt to adapt to an ever-changing globalized and accelerated world (Fenton, 2008).

Studying the interactions within the social movements as hybrids is interesting seeing how the hybrid network is multi-tiered and information therefore flows through the path of least resistance (Lim, 2013). This also allows for the creation of networks that consist of both strong and weak ties, and therefore face the challenges, as well as the opportunities both these types of ties provide. This also reflects the morphing and fluid nature of networks, continuously co-created through interactions between actors (Castell, 2000; Law, 1992). The hybrid nature of collective and connective action is also illustrated in the case of the Tunisian uprising, where the connective structures reflect an assemblage of loosely interconnected informal and formal structures with no sense of hierarchy (Lim, 2013). The connective structures, facilitated by the convergence of cultural and technological logic of media, created a platform to generate collective action among Tunisians who shared collective identities and collective frames, and at the same time connective action among individuals who sought more personalized paths to contribute to the movement through digital media (Lim, 2013). The challenge in identifying these logics, and especially DNA, is to understand when it becomes chaotic and unproductive, and when it attains higher levels of focus and sustained engagement over time. It is therefore relevant to question the potential impact of DNA, as Gladwell argues that the weak tied connections and horizontal networks of DNA fail to generate the level of committed collective action that is required for the activism to achieve change (Gladwell, 2010). At the same time studies argue that DNA has the potential for social change (Segerberg & Bennett, 2011), especially through a hybrid model (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), which provides the potential for utilizing elements from both archetypes.

### 2.2.4 The impact of time

The majority of dynamics defining social media actions nowadays have evolved from the 90’s and 00’s (Chadwick, 2007), and in the case of the Tunisian uprising, the role of the internet in the
eventual change is argued to be the work of at least a decade (Lim, 2013). This argues that change does not happen overnight, and the dynamics defining social media interactions in 2016 potentially evolved over time as well. The aspect of time is therefore relevant. The internet has facilitated the bridging of different boundaries often in very short periods of time for the sake of a particular interest or issue (Chadwick, 2007). Time is furthermore very interesting on social media, as it is difficult to inspire commitment from actors in the digital society, and the speed at which actors can respond encourages a focus on short term and rapidly shifting issues rather than fully pledged ideologies (Fenton, 2008). Actors in an accelerated digital world are therefore seldom found making long-standing commitments, but rather engaging in fleeting movements with less initial commitment (Fenton, 2008). This is also the argument of Chadwick that identifies the bridging of organizational boundaries for very short periods of time, often for the sake of a particular campaign (Chadwick, 2007) This is also assumed to be reflected in the studied social movements, as this easy-come-easy-go politics that is found in these large-scale fluid networks inspired by mediating technologies (Fenton, 2008) rarely inspires long-term commitment. It is therefore unavoidable that levels and intensity of these movements fluctuate (Chadwick, 2007), but it is relevant to discuss what types of traces these interactions entail, and how the traces potentially influence the continuous co-creation. In this process memes is found to be valuable, as they can travel far and continuously be re-interpreted into new contexts and thus leave traces This was seen in the Put People First (PPF) campaign that through social media channels left traces for several years after the events (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012).The aspect of time is also relevant in the definition of a hybrid model, as these NSMs potentially inherit characteristics from both logics of action as a result of continuous interactions over time. Time is therefore interesting, as the social movements evolves over time and might reflect different characteristics of the logic of action at different times, which potentially influence their potential to have an impact and achieve social change.

### 2.3 Interactions and the creation of ties

This thesis is based on a network perspective, where interactions are the primary unit of analysis. These interactions are what constitutes the networks and thereby the co-creation of communities. This section will review the literature discussing interactions and the creation of ties.

#### 2.3.1 Interactions influenced by Web 2.0

Interactions are fundamental in understanding the creation of ties and their potential impact on continuous interactions and tie-strength. Interactions are integral in their ability to constitute networks, inspire co-creation of communities (Choi & Scott, 2013; Castells, 2000; Fenton, 2008)
and possess the ability to channel information and resource flows (Chiu, Hsu & Wang, 2006). Interactions also defined social capital (Chiu et al., 2006), especially through the network configuration and the creation of ties (Choi & Scott, 2013)

With a baseline in the technological paradigm, and the focus on the organizational logics of movements that influence co-creation of online communities, understanding the impact of Web 2.0 on interactions is critical seeing how is has shifted the paradigm, facilitating new ways of interacting (Pedersen, Razmerita & Colleoni, 2014; Choi & Scott, 2013; Castells, 2000). Web 2.0 has enabled a critical mass of users through the internet, to mutually interact and engage in collaborations (Schneckenberg, 2009; Pedersen et al., 2014). These online interactions are crucial seeing that they create the background for establishing social ties, which has the potential to forge stronger relationships than face-to-face interactions (Seraj, 2012). At the same time, these interactions and the ties they entail are not only the potential outcome of social media, they are what constitutes the communities and the networks themselves, where the motivations to participate is affected by satisfaction with the interactions (Seraj, 2012). The technological revolution impacts interactions by extending potential communications by providing means to interact across time and space (Haythornthwaite, 2002; Choi & Scott, 2013; Castells, 2000). The potential for asynchronous communication allows individuals separated by time and space to continuously interact (Hwang, Singh & Argote, 2012; Choi & Scott, 2013; Castells, 2000). Interactions on social media also possess the potential to forge ties that impacts the individual through rich interactions and given enough time (Choi & Scott, 2013), enabling individuals to create fully formed impressions of other individuals based solely on the linguistic content of written electronic messages (Brown, Broderick & Lee, 2007). These interactions within online communities can also forge ties that evolve into offline relationships (Kozniets, de Valck, Wojnicke & Wilner, 2010).

It is also interesting to see how social media has changed the object of interactions, as interactions between actors do not necessarily distinguish between different nodes as individuals and networks (Ardichvili, Page & Wentling, 2003; Brown et al., 2007), seeing how actors in some cases see the network or community itself as the object of interaction, not other individuals in the network (Ardichvili et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2007). The argument is that these networks or communities themselves, while constituting interactions between actors, also are embedded in a larger context (Brass et al., 2004). This larger context, or dominating discourse (Dahlberg, 2007), will naturally have an impact on the networks and communities, as the communities also possess the potential to challenge the dominating discourse (Dahlberg, 2007). It is again important to
note, that the unit of analysis is the interactions and the strength of the ties these interactions entail and not the actors.

At the same time it is important to be aware of the potential limitations of online interactions. Even though they present a potential impact on the individual, studies show that some individuals still prefer face-to-face communications (Pedersen et al., 2014), and that the online interactions, through asynchronous communication still has limitations in transferring social cues and lacking interactive feedback (Hwang et al., 2012). The impact of offline interactions are in various literature mentioned as both more influential than online (Pedersen et al., 2014), and highly relevant in understanding the impact of online ties (Hardwick, Anderson & Cruickshank, 2013). Other theories do however suggest that the social capital created through online interactions (Chiu et al., 2006) can supersede the need for offline (face-to-face) interactions (Seraj, 2012). The analysis will therefore focus on online interactions based on the argument that online interaction provides a foundation for social cues and emotional support (Chiu et al., 2006), where different types of ties can be forged. It cannot be neglected that online interaction might lead to offline interactions, but the reverted process of initial offline interaction influencing the creation of online interaction is not studied in this thesis.

2.3.2 Tie strength

A tie is said to exist between actors whenever they exchange or share resources (Haythornthwaite, 2002), manifested in the frequency and kind of communication among individuals, in other words the interaction (Choi & Scott, 2013). These ties are often in flux and constantly rebuilt (Haythorthwaite, 2002). This constant re-creation is often a part of the interactions actors engage in, and in the co-creation of user-generated content and shared understandings that takes place within communities (Seraj, 2012). Network ties can be seen as conduits that transmit information (Brass et al., 2004), as well as being a channel where trust is created (Hardwick et al., 2013). The strength of the association is also crucial in the creation of networks and their durability (Law, 1992).

Similarity (homophily) can potentially impact the creation of ties (Pedersen et al., 2014; Brass et al. 2004; Hwang et al., 2012). At the same time Bisgin (2012) found that interest similarity only had marginal impact on tie formation, arguing that there is no clear cut explanation of how homophily impact the creation of ties. This thesis assumes, with outset in the network perspective, that when actors engage in interactions, ties are created. This also implies that whether or not homophily impacts the creation of ties, this thesis argues that actors interacting create ties. The
The strength of ties is defined as “A multidimensional construct that represents the strength of the dyadic interpersonal relationships in the contexts of social networks” (Brown et al., 2007 p. 4), which is influenced by the amount of time, emotional intensity, intimacy and reciprocal services that characterize the interaction (Chiu et al., 2006; Haythornthwaite, 2002; Choi & Scott, 2013). This thesis differentiates between weak and strong ties.

### 2.3.2.1 Weak ties

Ties are weak when they are new, distant and interactions are infrequent (Alavi & Tiwana, 2002). Weak ties do not require a shared understanding or reciprocity (Choi & Scott, 2013). Weak ties are casual (Schneckenberg, 2009) and important to the rate of information diffusion (Leskovec, Adamic & Huberman, 2007; Granovetter, 1983). Weak ties are the bridges between social peripheries that stretch beyond our direct contexts (Schneckenberg, 2009; Chiu et al., 2006; Seraj, 2012; Granovetter, 1983; Choi & Scott, 2013). This is relevant seeing that new ideas are argued to be created outside homophily (Hwang et al., 2012; Ardichvili et al., 2003), where the weak ties allow connections without emotional aspects (Choi & Scott, 2013). Weak ties are therefore crucial in initially inspiring the creation of networks and communities, where stronger ties often have the potential to act as a more maintaining factor. For a community to initially be created and based on weak ties there must be several ways or contexts in which people may form them, and a lack of weak ties potentially creates a fragmented and incoherent social system with less potential for information diffusion (Granovetter, 1983).

Social media enables users to easily and casually interact (Chiu et al., 2006; Seraj, 2012), which potentially increases the use of weak ties seeing how they are easily managed and maintained through Web 2.0 technologies (Choi & Scott, 2013). This is again illustrated by the potential for asynchronous, and in some cases anonymous, communication that connect individuals across time and space (Choi & Scott, 2013; Castells, 2000). It has also been suggested that the reduced cues in social media interactions work to the advantage of weak ties by reducing the risk associated with contacting unknown others (Haythornthwaite, 2002).

### 2.3.2.2 Strong ties

In contrast to weak ties, strong ties represent an intimate relationship between actors with voluntary investment in the tie, frequent interactions in multiple contexts (Brown et al., 2007), frequent emotional communication, shared confidences and reciprocity between actors (Choi & Scott, 1983). As actors learn more deep-level knowledge about one another the strength of the tie increases (Hwang et al., 2012). These strong ties are developed at the core of our respective
networks (Schneckenberg, 2009), and are influential in maintaining interaction levels (Seraj, 2012) seeing that when tie strength increase from weak to strong, the motivation to communicate follows (Haythornthwaite, 2002). Socially constructed norms are also more likely to be established and reinforced through stronger ties (Haythornthwaite, 2002).

Strong ties are relevant in relation to community creation seeing that the formation of such strong ties increases commitment, and potentially enables an online culture to emerge (Seraj, 2012), as well as increasing homophily between actors (Brown et al., 2007). Stronger ties also have greater influence on the receiver (Brown et al., 2007; Granovetter, 1983), and the potential for developing trust (Hardwick et al., 2013).

There are however potential challenges about strong ties as well; Granovetter (1983) argues that strong ties might fragment communities into encapsulated networks with poor connections, and argues for the importance of maintaining weak ties in order to engage in interactions that reach outside the context.

2.3.3 Trust

In relation to interactions, the dimension of trust is crucial for collaborations especially in virtual communities (Chiu et al., 2006; Choi & Scott, 2013), as the ability to create value or influence decisions are dependent on the ability to create trust (Haefliger, Monteiro, Foray & von Krogh, 2011). Homophily increases strength of ties which seems to activate trustworthiness (Brown et al., 2007). Interactions through online networks are therefore not only about sharing information, but also about building trust, friendships and alliances (Kozniets et al., 2010). Knowing and trusting the source also increases persuasion (Pedersen et al., 2014). Trust is often a product of stronger ties (Brown et al., 2007; Wasko, Faraj & Teigland, 2004), which argues for importance of strong ties in networks and communities. Ties and thereby trust can also be forged with the network as a whole reflected in the argument that "The relevant ties are those that develop between each individual and the networks as a whole" (Wasko et al., 2004 p. 502), also implying that seeing how stronger ties induce trust; a stronger tie with the network is assumed to result in trust in the network. Trust is also generated through co-creation that makes the content unbiased and trustable (Seraj, 2012), arguing that during the co-creation of content and shared understandings trust is generated, thus being a result of sharing and collaboration (Paroutis & Saleh, 2009), which relates to the notion that collaboration increases the strength of the tie, and therefore naturally also increases trust.
2.4 Online communities

Communities are especially relevant in NSMs as interactions within these movements are focused on forging a community rather than simply providing information (Fenton, 2008). Communities are co-created by individuals, whom in their need for a sense of connection (Fournier & Lee, 2009), interact and engage in co-creation based on solidarity (Choi & Scott, 2013; Castells, 2000; Fenton, 2008). These interactions are linked by shared interests, issues or values, and through these interactions, some form of shared understandings are co-created, which constitutes the community. Communities are seen as what Fournier & Lee describe as pools (Fournier & Lee, 2009 p. 5), that illustrate a community defined by shared values or goals and loose associations with one another.

2.4.1 Shared understandings

Shared understandings are created when individuals engage in interactions with each other and among other things share ideas, values, information (Luo et al., 2015) and in an attempt to make sense of reality compare their own perception of the world with others’ (Brass et al., 2004). A shared understanding is also important when mediating solidarity in an attempt to create coherence between thousands, potentially millions of fragmented subjectivities (Fenton, 2008). The creation of shared understandings is then important as the process of identifying with NSMs entails “feelings of solidarity towards people to whom one is not usually linked by direct personal contacts, but with whom one nonetheless shares aspirations and values” (Fenton, 2008 p. 51). The shared understandings then inspire solidarity and coherence which is crucial in the pursuit of achieving social change through collaborative effort.

A shared understanding is often a mental construct, an informal entity, which only exists in the minds of individuals that “glues” individuals together (Ardichvili et al., 2003, Fournier & Lee 2009). The shared understanding is a key ingredient for effective communication and collaboration (Alavi & Tiwana, 2002). The creation of shared understandings also provides the potential for inspiring cultural value (Seraj, 2012), which describes group norms and gives a sense of identity.

2.4.1.1 Homophily vs heterogeneousness

In the creation of shared understandings homophily increases, as it is the notions of shared understandings at the community level that drives online homophily and influences how information is interpreted (Brown et al., 2007). Homophily is argued to increase the strength of ties which seems to activate trustworthiness (Brown et al., 2007; Wasko et al., 2004), which in the end influences the motivation to share (Ardichvili et al., 2003).
A high level of homophily can however pose challenges by fragmenting the public sphere into deliberate enclaves (Dahlberg, 2007), which are defined by high levels of homophily and actors that actively avoid serendipitous encounters and only seek to reinforce the shared understandings. These deliberate enclaves often result in very strong ties within the community and possess the potential to be socially destructive (Dahlberg, 2007). At the same time it is seen that group polarization (Sunstein, 1999) might help fuel movements towards great value as with the civil rights and antislavery movements (Fenton, 2008). These deliberate enclaves might therefore foster great value, the potential value is however highly dependent on the ability of these enclaves to become influential beyond their ‘radical ghetto’ (Fenton, 2008) and as Dahlberg argues ‘challenge the dominating discourse’ (Dahlberg, 2007).

Heterogeneity is also important seeing how it allows for different interpretations, and different ideas that influence the dynamic co-creation of shared understandings. This dynamic process is often identified in weak-tied interactions between individuals from different contexts bounded in different shared understandings, and is also what enables communities to change over time by reflecting new ideas, developments and co-creation (Wasko et al., 2004; Razmerita et al., 2009). The community is therefore regarded as a dynamic structure rather than a static institution (Seufert, von Krogh & Bach, 1999). This dynamic aspect also presents the potential for the communities to dissolve, either by integrating with other communities, or due to lack of activity, again reflecting the fluctuating levels of intensity over time. The interesting aspect is therefore again to what extend these communities present the potential to have an impact and to what extent they leave “traces” or morph into other types of entities achieving a new range of possibilities.

2.4.2 The role of Web 2.0 and social media

The technological revolution is, among other things, crucial in its impact on the creation of online communities by enabling actors to co-create these shared understandings through interactions (Lee & Lan, 2007). This is made possible through Web 2.0 that has produced new ways of what it means to interact (Lewis, Pea & Rosen, 2010; Razmerita, Kirchner & Nabeth, 2014) especially by the ability to disregard geographical differences (Chiu et al., 2006), through the space of flows (Castells, 2000) and the ability to mediate rich interactions with many other people (Choi & Scott, 2013; Schneckenberg, 2009). The impact is also seen in the support of ad-hoc network formation, where a wide array of individuals with different ideas, expertise and from different contexts is brought together (Yates & Paucette, 2011). This is also seen in NSMs where participants are
drawn together based on shared values and political understandings by sharing beliefs in certain narratives (Fenton, 2008) potentially inspiring the co-creation of shared understandings.

These communities are continuously co-created by all users through collaboration (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009; Razmerita et al., 2014). The main idea by these collaborations is that the “joint effort of many actors leads to a better outcome than any actor could achieve individually” (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009 p. 62) and the collaborative effort within these communities is seen as an attempt to achieve public good (Wasko et al., 2004; Fournier & Lee, 2009), as well as increasing the intellectual value (Seraj, 2012) of the community which adds value to the community as well as potentially attracting and retaining members. This is interesting when seeing that collaborative projects are trending towards becoming the main source of information for many consumers (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009; Ponte & Simon, 2011), at the same time social media is not only the main source of information, but also the main source of creation seeing that individuals actively engage in both producing and consuming information, so-called “prosumers” (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009; Seraj 2012).

However these online communities are more than just information processing, it is seen that communities exist entirely online, and despite limited nonverbal social cues still provide social resources such as emotional support and a sense of belonging (Brown et al., 2007), and potentially has the ability to shape behavior of members (Chiu et al., 2006; Jin, Zhong & Zhai, 2015; Brass et al., 2004). It is also seen that the limited social cues in online communities has resulted in more equalized participation (Hwang et al., 2012). The key factor is the propensity for individuals to voluntary participate (Wasko et al., 2004). A motivation for voluntary participation might be the successful functioning and growth of the virtual communities, seeing that it in some cases is valued higher than personal benefits (Chiu et al., 2006).

### 2.4.3 Macro-structural properties of communities

Wasko et al. (2004) identifies five different macro-structural properties of online communities. Based on these a framework is proposed that illustrates the different characteristics of how the relatively vague concept *community* is structurally identified in the thesis. This creates a baseline for studying how the interactions within networks, constitute the co-creation of these communities and their dynamic nature.
Framework 2: Macro-structural properties of studied online communities (Author’s own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework 2</th>
<th>Macro-structural properties of studied online communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network control</td>
<td>Online communities are emergent and dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No formal control dictating interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication channel</td>
<td>Interactions take place on social media such as Twitter, which are defined by asynchronous non-verbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Likes, re-tweets and comments</em> are seen as a way of interacting and endorsing the communicated content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network size</td>
<td>Communities are identified as dynamic and fluid objects that constantly morph their boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Communities are defined by unrestricted access allowing everyone to participate and potentially engage in co-creation of the shared understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities reflect the <em>pancake</em>-structure (Schneckenberg, 2009) where everyone can participate, interact and collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Communities are defined by individual voluntary participation, where actors are individually motivated to engage in co-creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The actor individually determines the type and level of participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3: Methodology

The following part of the thesis describes the methodology employed, how data is collected and how it is analyzed. The methodology takes outset in a case study design (Bryman & Bell, 2007) based on a netnographic approach as defined by Kozniets (2002).

3.1 Case study design

In the process of data collection and analysis the *case study design* (Bryman & Bell, 2007) and a *netnographic approach* (Kozniets, 2002) has been chosen. The thesis is based on deductive reasoning as hypotheses are derived from theories and tested in the selected cases. The methodology is tightly linked to the *Theory of Science* described in part 2.1. The case study design is chosen for its potential to reveal data that can lead to novel and interesting conclusions, based on some sort of bounded situation by investigating the complex nature of a certain case. The case study will study three different social movements in order to increase *external validity* (Bryman &
Bell, 2007) by cross checking findings. The aim of the case study analysis is to concentrate on unique features of the cases and develop a deeper understanding of their complexity.

A case study approach is chosen for its potential to employ both quantitative and qualitative methods, as the study is based on elements from both these methods. The case study is based on a *comparative design* (Bryman & Bell, 2007), as the cases are studied using more or less identical methods in order to compare the cases and identify their uniqueness, as well as potential common denominators by developing a deeper understanding of their complexity and cross-validating the findings.

**3.2 Netnographic study design**

Based on the cases a *netnographic study* (Koznietz, 2002) is conducted. Netnography is a “new qualitative research methodology that adapts ethnographic research techniques to the study of cultures and communities that are emerging through computer-mediated communications” (Koznietz, 2002 p. 2), which makes it ideal for this thesis. A qualitative approach is particularly useful for studying underlying needs and meanings (Koznietz, 2002), as well as accepting a view of social reality as a constantly shifting emergent property of individuals’ creation (Bryman & Bell, 2007) which corresponds with the network perspective. The purpose of netnography is to gain an understanding of virtual communities (Sandlin, 2007), and uses the information publicly available to identify and understand the online communities (Koznietz, 2002). Netnography can be conducted entirely unobtrusively if desired and therefore has the potential to capture individuals and groups in their natural setting, conducting their everyday life practices (Koznietz, 2002), which therefore avoids the issue of the researcher influencing the context of study. A traditional netnographic study consists of the following parts (Koznietz, 2002):

**3.2.1 Gaining Entrée**

A netnographic study requires the researcher to have a specific question in mind, identify appropriate online forums and learn as much as possible about the forums, groups and members. When chosen the researcher should spend time in the community to gain a deeper understanding (Sandlin, 2007).

**3.2.2 Gathering and analyzing data**

There are at least two different types of data: Data that is directly copied from the interactions, and data that is inscribed regarding observations of the community. The choice of which data to save and which to pursue is important and should be guided by the research question and
available resources. During the research, it is recommended that the researcher writes down reflections, as these can prove invaluable to contextualize the data. The data should in the end be classified and coded.

3.2.3 Ensuring trustworthy interpretation
As netnography studies individuals in their natural “habitats” by being unobtrusive, the informants may be presumed to present themselves as they normally would. Every interaction is therefore relevant observational data that in itself is capable of being trustworthy. By studying the interactions the potential challenge of actors claiming to be someone else is avoided. Due to the nature of social media, the audience possess the power to decide whose messages will be widely heard, which undermines the ability of any one individual or group to control a movement’s social media communication. The findings are however often limited to the specific context and can’t be generalized.

3.2.4 Conducting ethical research
Kozniets argues that in online communities a clear consensus on ethics is missing and identifies two issues; to what extent online communities are considered to be private or public, and what constitutes “informed consent” in an online context? Langer & Beckman suggests differentiating between communities where a password is needed as semi-private and if anyone can participate in the interaction without any restrictions it should be considered public (Langer & Beckman, 2005).

The need for obtaining informed consent in the context of social media is disregarded seeing that updates and the shared content is publicly available and can be considered public information, as identified in Twitter’s Terms of Service: “This license is you authorizing us to make your Tweets on the Twitter Services available to the rest of the world” (Twitter.com, 2016a) arguing that tweets are public information. The ethical line between obtaining informed consent and not is therefore dependent on the type of information gathered, however the analysis should always strive to ensure individuals anonymity.

3.2.5 Member checking
Finally member checking is the process of presenting some or all findings to the people who have been studied in order to gain feedback which could elaborate further on comments and give specific insights into meanings. This is not done in this thesis due to the large-scale fluid nature of the studied communities.
3.3 Data collection

The netnographic study is based on data collected from key periods of the movements. The collected data consists of Twitter-interactions (tweets) between individuals who use a certain hashtag (#) that defines the movement. The focus on tweets with a certain hashtag is done within the concept of a hashtag's function. A hashtag is used for organizing and categorizing tweets (Twitter.com, 2016b) which connects a single tweet with all other tweets also including the same hashtag. This also means that “hashtagged” words in some cases become a symbol, a trending topic or a proper noun for something greater than the word itself, as seen in the cases, where the concept of the movement is defined by the hashtag e.g. #BlackLivesMatter, that through the hashtag defines the purpose of the movement.

The data collection extracted approximately 2000 tweets for each social movement through the hashtags associated with them; #YesAllWomen, #BlackLivesMatter and #IceBucketChallenge, the tweets are collected over three different key periods for each movement where the usage of the hashtag peaked. The tweets are collected manually by searching for the specific hashtag on specific days and copying the available tweets into a dataset (Example in appendix 1, all datasets are found on the CD) using Twitter’s SEARCH APIs (Twitter.com, 2016c) the data represented in the dataset is filtered and sorted, as the data copied from Twitter in the raw form was disorganized and cluttered. In this process images were removed from the tweets, however they are still available in the raw data and were taking into account during data coding. Another potential limitation is that Twitter’s Search API is not meant to be an exhaustive source of tweets, but more focused on relevance rather than completeness (Twitter.com, 2016c), which means that not all tweets containing the hashtags are indexed or available through the search interface (Twitter.com, 2016d). The issue of completeness is however partially avoided as the collected tweets were meant as a representative sample collected as a simple random convenience sample (Bryman & Bell, 2007). The choice to study 2000 tweets from each movement is due to limited time and resources, as a larger sample size naturally would have ensured a more substantiated baseline for the analysis. However, as the nature of the communities, created within the movements are morphing and fluid, the findings from the sampling is not by any means representative of all the values, shared understandings and challenges embedded in the movements. The sample size is therefore assumed to provide a substantial representative baseline for the analysis.
The tweets are coded manually using NVivo 11 based on the coding manual (Appendix 2). The coding categories were found by reading the data and identifying reoccurring themes and issues based on the content of the tweet as well as accounting for potential attached images or videos. This also provided contextual information for some of the tweets that were part of a discussion. Thoughts and reflections noted as per Kozniets (2002) recommendation were also used in identifying relevant coding categories. Besides the reoccurring themes, the tweets are also coded based on affective values (See Appendix 2) in order to potentially identify interesting relations between the themes and dominating affective values. When coding data two types of reliability measures are used; inter-coder-reliability and intra-coder-reliability (Andersen, Hansen & Klemmensen, 2012). Due to a lack of available resources the inter-coder-reliability was not tested, as it requires different coders to code the same material. Intra-coder-reliability was tested by coding samples of the tweets again which showed a high level of correlation.

3.3.1 Case presentation
This section provides more specific insight into the key periods of data collection and how the data was coded for the specific cases.

3.3.1.1 #YesAllWomen
#YesAllWomen was chosen as one of the studied cases as it illustrates the ability of social media interactions to connect individuals and through leaderless emerging networks of individuals raise awareness about an experienced issue.

3.3.1.1.1 Gaining Entréé
The hashtag was used on Facebook, Twitter and Tumblr as well as showing up sporadically elsewhere. Twitter is chosen as the studied context, as the movement originated and existed predominantly on Twitter. Twitter is also chosen for its capacity for large amounts of traffic and the ability to directly and publicly mediate interactions between actors.

3.3.1.1.2 Gathering data and ethics
The primary data collected are the tweets from women sharing stories under the hashtag #YesAllWomen. The data is collected without any interference from the researcher as the analyzed interactions took place over a year before this analysis, and the actors are therefore presumed to present themselves as they normally would. The interactions took place in large-scale fluid networks on a public platform where shared content is publicly available. The researcher did therefore not disclose his presence.
The secondary data collected is based on a wide array of different articles, blog posts and forum discussions written about the movement. Any thoughts that occurred during the study of both the tweets as well as the collection of information through reading the articles and other relevant sources were noted per Kozniets (2002) recommendation.

The primary data collected for studying the movement consists of 2110 tweets from three following days, the 25th (679 tweets) 26th (640 tweets) and 27th (792 tweets) of May 2014. These specific days were chosen based on the graph (Figure 1) that illustrate the timeline of #YesAllWomen tweets for the period 24/5-2014 until 29/5-2014 as these days represent the key period were the movement had the highest levels of activity. The data shows a rapid increase in tweets containing the hashtag, especially until the 25th of May 2014, thereafter the movement slowly decreased in intensity. For unknown reasons Twitter’s SEARCH API’s does not show any tweets on the #YesAllWomen hashtag before the 25th, which is why that is chosen as the first of the three days data were collected from. The collected tweets consist of 1618 unique contributors arguing for a high level of diversity (Appendix 3, CD).

Coding the tweets found four relevant categories of tweets; *Raising awareness, Personal stories, Collaboration* and *In-group-statements*. Two other categories of tweets were also identified but are omitted in the analysis; *irrelevant tweets* and *disagreement* (See appendix 2 for details).
3.3.1.2 #BlackLivesMatter

The #BlackLivesMatter movement was chosen as one of the studied cases for its potential to illustrate the connection of large networks of individuals based on coherence and the organizing ability of Twitter, as well as the potential for generating ties between actors that manifested in offline activism.

3.3.1.2.1 Gaining Entrée

Traces of the movement are found on a wide array of platforms including: Periscope, Vine, Instagram, Facebook, YouTube and Reddit, but primarily Twitter. Even though the movement originally started on Facebook, Twitter has become the primary platform for the Black Lives Matter-movement (Freelon, Mcilwain & Clark, 2016; Stephen, 2015), as it allows for the mobilization of a large crowd, and potentially utilize the world as an audience and inspire discussions. Twitter is again chosen as the studied platform of interactions as it is the main social network used by the movement. Twitter is also chosen due to its capacity for large amount of traffic and publicly available interactions. Data from the Black Lives Matter movement shows that #BlackLivesMatter is the most-used hashtag that does not refer to a single event (Freelon et al., 2016), which is why it is chosen in this study. The context of study is therefore defined by interactions that entail the hashtag #BlackLivesMatter, as well as second hand data describing the movement.

3.3.1.2.2 Gathering data and ethics

In order to gain an understanding of the values embedded within the movement time was spent dwelling on different interactions, reading the history of the movement, learning about the founders as well as engaging in understanding the potential impact the movement has had and potentially also will have. Understanding some aspects of the offline-activism based on the black lives matter statement also had an impact. The research is conducted unobtrusively as the interactions and culture study is based on publicly available information that is shared through public platforms. It is therefore expected that the actors are behaving naturally. The actors were not contacted and informed of the study, and based on Twitters TOS (Twitter.com, 2016a) the collected data is perceived as public information.
In total 2050 tweets where collected from 1552 unique contributors (Appendix 4, CD) The primary data is collected over three periods where the use of #BlackLivesMatter initially peaked, as shown in the graph (Figure 2): 24th November (635), 3rd December (717) and 13th December (698). These periods were chosen for their potential to illustrate the values and shared understandings embedded in the movement when it grew and gained awareness on an international scale. The data shows that the #BlackLivesMatter hashtag appeared in 2,309 tweets on the 23rd November 2014 and in 103,319 tweets on the 24th November 2014 (Freelon et al., 2016). The reason for this huge spike is closely related to the grand jury decision not to indict Darren Wilson for the death of Michael Brown. Two weeks later a similar occurrence took place, as a grand jury again chose not to indict the cop who killed Eric Garner, generating an even greater spike on December 3rd. The last date chosen for data collection represents a day where multiple protests against police brutality were held simultaneously across USA generating a spike in #BlackLivesMatter tweets. Pictures and videos are often used in the tweets, and are accounted for during the coding.

The coding process is based on five relevant categories. Raising awareness, Offline activism, Anti-authorities, Victimization and Collaboration. Again tweets categorized as Disagreement or Irrelevant are omitted (See appendix 2 for details).

### 3.3.1.3 #IceBucketChallenge

The social media campaign revolving around the **ALS Ice bucket challenge** is chosen for its ability to showcase the potential influence of social media, how trending ideas are spread and how it inspired actors to interact.
3.3.1.3.1 Gaining Entrée
The ALS Ice Bucket Challenge spread to a wide array of different social media platforms including Instagram, Vine, Reddit, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and Snapchat, which all provide an opportunity for individuals to share content and interact. Besides these social media platforms the movement also raised awareness through mainstream media on many different news channels and papers. However, as the purpose of this study is to understand the values and decisions within online communities the study is limited to the social media platforms. Twitter is chosen as the studied platform for its capacity for high amounts of traffic, the large number of discrete message posters and potential for high levels of descriptive rich data and between-member interactions.

3.3.1.3.2 Gathering data and ethics
Data is gathered as second hand data from Facebook, News sites and other likewise sources that refer to the social media movement and its impact. These second hand sources provide data that is useful in the creation of an overall impression and general understanding of the movement. Primary data is gathered through data collection of interactions between individuals embedded in the context. The studied interactions all took place before the research for this thesis started. The actors are therefore presumed to act and interact naturally. The data is therefore also collected through public platforms where the shared information is deemed public information. Due to the data being available as public information, the research was done without obtaining informed consent.

![Figure 3: Timeline of #IceBucketChallenge](image-url)
The primary is collected over three time periods as the other movements. The tweets are collected from the 15th (629), the 17th (639) and the 19th (654) of May 2014 providing a total of 1922 tweets in the primary dataset, from 1746 unique users (Appendix 7, CD). These three days were chosen as data suggests that the ice bucket challenge started trending on the 15th until it peaked days later (Figure 3 Splashscore.com, 2014). A choice was made to collect tweets containing the hashtag #IceBucketChallenge over #ALSIcebucketchallenge, as #IceBucketChallenge was assumed to capture the broader use of the meme, and potentially showcase how it travelled across communities. #IceBucketChallenge is also the hashtag used by most of the secondary data (Splashscore.com, 2014).

The coding process found three relevant categories: Raising awareness, personal stories and collaboration. The amount of irrelevant tweets is significantly larger in this case than the others due to unforeseen technical difficulties with Twitter’s SEARCH APIs (Twitter.com, 2016d) that did not sort out non-English tweets from the stream. This was unfortunately discovered too late, however seeing that 210 out of the 218 irrelevant-coded tweets are due to foreign language it is assumed that this large amount of irrelevant tweets will not impact the analysis other than through a relatively smaller sample size than the other two cases (See appendix 2 for details).
Part 4: Findings and analysis

This part consists of the empirical data and the analysis of the three different social movements. The movements are first introduced and contextual information is provided. The movements are then analyzed with an outset in the literature review to identify how the logics of action are reflected in the interactions and how these potentially influence the co-creation of shared understandings constituting a community.

4.1 #YesAllWomen

4.1.1 Introduction

The first of the three studied social movements is the social media movement revolving around the hashtag #YesAllWomen. The #YesAllWomen-movement started after the 2014 Isla Vista killings where seven people – including the shooter – were killed and several more injured (Grinberg, 2014). The shooting was premeditated by a man who through YouTube videos and a 147-page “manifesto” created an image of himself as a lonely misogynist who felt entitled to the attention of women based on his own perceived intelligence and status (Pachal, 2014). This terrible and extreme case of perceived male sexual entitlement resonated with large amounts of women globally, which inspired the hashtag #YesAllWomen to be a label under which women shared their experiences with male entitlement.

The hashtag “#YesAllWomen” was “born” in a Twitter conversation between Annie Cardi (@anniecardi) and another woman who since then has changed her account to private in order to protect her identity (Pachal, 2014). It has been argued (Woolley, 2014) that “YesAllWomen” is an unsubtle pushback against the #NotAllMen movement, which is used predominantly by men arguing against some of the generalizations that depicts men as violent misogynists.

The movement emerged primarily through Twitter without any form of formal or central leadership other than the shared belief in the narrative behind the hashtag and the values of the stories that were shared. The #YesAllWomen tweets represent a spontaneously rising chorus of individual voices that through the mediating ability of social media in a joint effort strived to achieve something bigger as seen in NSMs (Fenton, 2008).

4.1.1.1 Impact

The movement raised awareness about gender inequality and the male entitlement all women experience on a daily basis, as it shed light on persisting issues like rape and our society. This led
the way for other more formal organizations to seek change. An example of this is the UN gender equality campaign; HeForShe (HeForShe.org, 2016).

4.1.1.2 Criticism
The movement has received a fair amount of criticism, some of the major themes that also are reflected in the 1,6% of the tweets found to disagree are:

4.1.1.2.1 Generalizing
The movement received criticism from the male population that argued the movement generalized the male population. The critics argued the movement depicts all men as rapist or violent misogynist.

4.1.1.2.2 Yes all women versus Yes all people
In addition the movement has also received criticism in relation to the focus on gender equality for women only. The prevailing argument is that it is ironic how the movement strives for equality, but only for one of the genders, and that it instead should focus on YesAllPeople.

4.1.2 Findings
This following section describes the findings of the data-coding, the four main categories and interesting findings from the analysis of the primary data. The next section will dig a bit deeper into the categories and conduct a more in-depth study of the movement with outset in the major trends identified.

Figure 4: Categories of #YesAllWomen tweets

- Raising awareness 34%
- Personal stories 34%
- Collaboration 16%
- Disagreement 2%
- Irrelevant 4%
- Ingroup notions 10%
4.1.2.1 **Raising awareness (YAW-1, appendix 6, CD)**

The first major category of tweets identified within the social movement is *raising awareness*. This is coherent with the need for speaking up against male entitlement which founded the movement. Tweets categorized as *raising awareness* accounted for 34% of all collected tweets. Tweets in this category will often employ a generalizing perspective and focus on gender equality in society, and how society fails to embrace existing issues. The amount of *negative* (31.7%) and *offensive* affective value (25.6%) illustrates that aspiring to *raise awareness* is often caused by a need to seek change or negative experiences, however all six values were represented arguing that the actors utilize different action frames when engaging in the aspect of raising awareness.

4.1.2.1.1 Examples of tweets
- “#YesAllWomen because it’s inappropriate for girls to wear shorts at school but guys can walk around shirtless” (YAW-1, ref. 40 p. 3)
- “because there are classes on how to prevent rape when we really should be telling people not to rape #yesallwomen” (YAW-1, ref. 75 p. 6)

4.1.2.2 **Personal stories (YAW-2, appendix 7, CD)**

The next major category identified in the movement is that a large amount of actors share a personal story or utilize a *personalized action frame* when interacting. This category also accounts for 34% of all the collected tweets. This category of tweets represents the large amount of actors who are willing to trust the movement as a whole, and expose themselves as they share personal experiences with *rape, sexual harassment* and *violence* and all reflect how the actors in some way or another have personal experiences with male entitlement. The affective values again illustrate a large amount of *negative* stories (43%) being shared, however in contrast to the *raise awareness* category, the personal stories represent a much more *defensive* perspective, as only 10.1% of the tweet are found to be *offensive*, while 42.2% of the tweets are *defensive*. 
4.1.2.2.1 Examples of tweets
- “Because I was working when men tried to take pictures of my ass. I was under age. #YesAllWomen” (YAW-2, ref. 254 p. 53)
- “#YesAllWomen because “what were you wearing” is the first question anyone asks me when I talk about my rape.” (YAW-2, ref. 41 p. 3).

4.1.2.3 Collaboration (YAW-3, appendix 8, CD)
The first lesser category is collaboration, which entail tweets that seek collaboration between actors and describe how women collaborate to cope with male entitlement. This type of tweets account for 16,7% of the collected tweets and is heavily defined by the supportive value (75,2%). The tweets categorized as collaborative are also the tweets that seek to endorse others or support the movement as a whole and amplify the “volume” of the movement by encouraging and endorsing other actors and their contributions. These are also the tweets that indirectly seek to raise awareness through collaboration, either in conversations or collaboration with the community as a whole.

4.1.2.3.1 Examples of tweets
- “If I could favourite and retweet every #YesAllWomen tweet, I would. SO many smart, eloquent people are on the internet” (YAW-3, ref. 11 p. 1)
- “I use my voice for those who can’t because this is what we face. #YesAllWomen” (YAW-3, ref. 70 p. 5)

4.1.2.4 Ingroup notions (YAW-4, appendix 9, CD)
The second lesser category is the in-group tweets, which are defined by more polarized opinions targeted directly against men as the subject of discussion. These types of tweets account for 10%
and are therefore less prevalent than the other categories, but still represent a relevant part of the community. This category of tweets is more progressively arguing that men are the problem and not the society as a whole. This results in tweets that are more direct and unsubtle in their contributions, reflected in the large amount of offensive tweets (63.8%).

4.1.2.4.1 Examples of tweets
- “Because the biggest statistical threat to men is heart disease and the biggest statistical threat to women is male violence” (YAW-4, ref. 47 p. 13)
- “All men are potential threats. It’s how we have to see the world to stay safe That’s why we need feminism #yesallwomen” (YAW-4, ref. 22 p. 6)

4.1.2.5 Other relevant findings
Besides these four main categories of tweets a number of certain reoccurring themes were identified in the tweets.

4.1.2.5.1 Rape
The word rape is mentioned 129 times and raped is mentioned 63. This means that nearly 10% of the tweets in some way or another discuss or reference rape in the data. The theme rape is especially seen in the raising awareness category which accounts for 54.2% of the mentions.

4.1.2.5.2 Society
Another reoccurring theme is the discussion about society or culture. This is seen in the personal stories that accounts for 64.4% of the total times (169) “told” and “taught” are used, or raising awareness that
accounts for 53.3% of the total times (90) that either “world”, “society” or “culture” is used.

4.1.3 In-depth analysis of #YesAllWomen

4.1.3.1 Connective action

The logic of connective action can be identified in the tweets categorized as raising awareness, as the collected tweets are emerging through DNA where the large number of unique actors in these large-scale fluid networks illustrate a movement without any formal organizing, no central leadership, reflecting the shift from “organizations organizing” to more individual organizing (Wright, 2015; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). The movement is organized through technological affordances, by utilizing the organizational ability of the hashtag in order to self-organize large networks of individuals into a chorus of spontaneously rising voices. This takes place through weak-tied interactions with the network as a whole instead of isolated individuals by referring to #YesAllWomen instead of single actors; “#YesAllWomen You deserve better” (YAW-3, ref. 7 p. 9) or “I stand with #YesAllWomen” (YAW-3, ref. 37 p. 21). This also reflects the space of flows, as mediating technologies enabled the connection of a large-scale fluid network without geographical boundaries.

The self-organizing nature of the movement also reflects a leaderless movement that is dependent on voluntary participation by actors that actively engage in co-creation. This can be seen in the large amount of personal stories, as they illustrate the use of personalized action frames (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012) to interpret and translate the #YesAllWomen-movement and thus co-create the movement by adding their own perspective. This use of personalized action frames also enable the communicated content to move across cultural and geographical boundaries.

The use of technology as the organizing agent in conjunction with the large amount of personal stories shared through voluntary participation also represents another characteristic of the connective action. The act of sharing personal stories in the pursuit of self-validation is endorsed by others through likes and re-tweets which act as a self-motivating factor. This is especially seen in the collaboration tweets that often in a supportive manner encourage others to re-tweet content and read the #YesAllWomen tweets; “I’ll never not retweet a #YesAllWomen tweet.” (YAW-3, ref. 56 p. 13) or “Check out the #YesAllWomen hashtag. Interesting/Powerful social media campaign” (YAW-3, ref. 87 p. 15). Endorsing others by either liking or re-tweeting then becomes an act of personal expression and self-validation by contributing to a common good and act as a legitimization process (Lim, 2013; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). The affordances of social media is
therefore reflected in this process, as Twitter-interactions are dependent on others reciprocating this act of sharing, by liking and re-tweeting as well as sharing their own content empowering the potential reach and impact of the movement as a tool for social change (Fenton 2008). The motivation for participating is therefore based on the act of sharing, which Bennett & Segerberg (2012) notes as a “linchpin” of connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012).

4.1.3.2 Collective action
Interestingly, while the large amount of generalized tweets reflected in the raising awareness category illustrates DNA, traces of a united ‘we’ can also be identified, as it is often assumed that all women experience the same issues, reflected in arguments like “I guarantee you, every. Single one. Of your female friends has been harassed by a man in one way or another” (YAW-1, ref. 28 p. 2), or phrases like “because society has taught us” (YAW-1 ref. 113 p. 8), “We’re taught…” (YAW-3, ref. 11 p. 19) or “We shouldn’t...” (YAW-1, ref. p. 17). These examples illustrate that even though they are self-organizing, many of the actors that interact, engage in the co-construction of a united ‘we’, a collective identity that is assumed to be shared by all women, which is reinforced by the large amount of actors that actively take part in co-creating and reinforcing the collective ‘we’.

This construction of a collective identity has its outset in the motivation for collectively seeking social change by forging a common cause and through joint effort seeks social change. This creation of a collective identity is further substantiated in the ingroup-tweets, that reflects some level of group polarization (Sunstein, 1999), where the collective identity is reinforced by arguing how males are the problem and potentially generate stronger ties between the actors.

The personal stories are also relevant in collective action, as the personalized action frames, through the continuous interactions and collaboration, based on the joint effort of actors collectively forging a common cause, are articulated into collective action frames. These collective frames then influence the co-creation of a collective identity. This is for example seen in the large amount of defensive interactions that reflect the collective identity of women as victims of society. This process can also be identified in the collaboration-segment, as these tweets illustrate how the actors perceive this as a joint effort; “We’ve been silenced for too long, so no we’re not gonna shut up. #YesAllWomen” (YAW-3, ref. 118 p. 17).

The construction of collective action frames, based on the collective identity framing, is also identified in the general theme of the tweets that attempt to highlight and potentially challenge a perceived general understanding; “#YesAllWomen because people are more concerned about why
women stay in abusive relationships rather than why are men abusing women.” (YAW-1, ref. 92 p. 23), “#YesAllWomen because when a girl is harassed or even groped by a stranger in public, we’re told to “take it as a compliment”” (YAW-1, ref. 156 p. 48). These examples illustrate the use of collective action frames, where all women are perceived to be victims of male entitlement and a society that does nothing to help them. By engaging in these stories and sharing their own these actors take part in co-creation of the narrative, and thereby the co-construction of a collective identity. This also illustrates how participants in the NSMs as drawn together by common elements in their value systems and shared beliefs in narratives that problematize particular social phenomena (Fenton, 2008).

4.1.3.3 The community
The following section identifies some of the major shared understandings constituting the community, and how these shared understandings are influenced by the logics of action. The community is identified as a mental construction where the hashtag act as the organizing agent; “Because we need a hashtag to make a statement #YesAllWomen” (YAW-3, ref. 100 p. 16), reflecting the concept of pools (Fournier & Lee, 2009).

4.1.3.3.1 Personal stories
The analysis of the data and influence of the logics of action identify the co-creation of a shared understanding; the value in sharing personal stories. The shared understanding of the importance of personal stories is identified in the use of personalized action frames, that motivated by the act of sharing illustrate self-organizing DNA.

The personal stories are important as they provide new perspectives, seeing how these personal stories based on personalized action frames provides something new, as the experience might be well-known, but the specific story is new e.g. “Because I was sexually assaulted at a party and an officer in the USMC told my husband “well, leave her home next time #yesallwomen”” (YAW-2, ref. 170 p. 29). The personal stories are therefore also identified as used in the process of self-validation, as the actors sharing through personalized action frames seeks legitimization from the community. This is seen in how endorsement is given to those that share; “If I’m being honest, I have only been moved by #YesAllWomen’s personal stories. Some brave folks out there and I really respect them/you.” (YAW-3, ref. 81 p. 14).

This reveals how personal stories are shared with the community and thereby illustrate trust in the community as a whole. This can be identified by looking at the themes of the shared stories which describe how women experience violence, rape or being scared in everyday life. These personal
stories are interesting regarding trust, as these interactions act as a vehicle for the co-creation process, and thereby collaboration between actors. This illustrates the potential for inspiring interpersonal interactions, collaboration and co-creation, which potentially leads to the creation of stronger ties "I am having some intense #YesAllWomen feels re: areas in which I do & don't have privilege. ping me if it’s okay to talk to you about this?" (YAW-3, ref. 125 p. 18), which potentially inspires trust.

These personal stories are furthermore integral to the movement by inspiring others to share their stories as a way of supporting each other and emphasizing the statement, which illustrates reciprocation in act of sharing, as well as illustrating the initial organizational dynamic of self-organizing networks based on personalized action frames as a process of self-validation.

4.1.3.3.2 Collaboration

Collaboration is identified as a shared understanding within the community, as the community is defined by actors that seek to make sense of the world by comparing their perception, the personal stories, with others’ (Brass et al., 2004). This also reflects the argument that individuals in their need for a sense of connection interact and engage in co-creation of communities (Fournier & Lee, 2009; Choi & Scott, 2013; Castells, 2000) e.g. “Let’s do a survey: how many of y’all check your backseat before you drive? ...” (YAW-1, ref. 43 p. 40). The shared understanding collaboration is dependent on the propensity for voluntary participation by individuals that through the self-motivating act of sharing engage in co-creation, illustrating the influence of the logic of connective action. This result in the co-creation of dynamic communities, as every actor sharing content and using the #YesAllWomen-hashtag take part in co-creation of the community. The mixed participation of a wide array of differentiating individuals illustrates unrestricted access, reflecting how weak-tied interactions link social peripheries enable the co-creation of high quality user-generated content, which adds value to the community, as well as potentially attracting and retaining more members (Seraj, 2012).

This also illustrates the collective forging of a common cause “This is a very important hashtag. I recommend reading a few of these tweets. #YesAllWomen” (YAW-3, ref. 35 p. 21) or “#YesAllWomen. This might be the most important and my favorite hashtag I’ve ever seen.” (YAW-3, ref. 109 p. 8). This common cause creates the baseline for the construction of a united "we", which is a result of continuous interaction and collaboration. This is crucial in community creation, as it potentially provides the emotional support and sense of belonging that Brown et al., (2007) identifies as seen in the tweet “I’ve found more support and encouragement from
"#YesAllWomen in the past 24 hours than I’ve had for the past 20 years of my life." (YAW-3, ref. 76 p. 14). Collaboration is therefore crucial as it potentially increases homophily and induces coherence between fragmented actors in an attempt to mediate solidarity and inspire trust (Paroutis & Saleh, 2009).

Collaboration is also influential on the act of sharing, as the movement lacks formal organization, and is dependent on DNA, which makes every single interaction crucial. These individual interactions are then empowered through the potential embedded in a joint effort (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009 p. 62), which ties back to the collective action of forging a common cause, “Click the hashtag. Just go. Listen #YesAllWomen” (YAW-3, ref. 59 p. 22). This also argues that by forging a common cause and collective seeking social change, the community can be identified as a collaborative project with a large group of individuals that based on the limited amount of social cues all are equalized in participation (Hwang et al., 2004).

4.1.3.3.3 Raising awareness

The process of collaboration results in actors interacting, whom are brought together in these ad-hoc networks based on a common cause and through joint effort seeks social change, and co-creates the shared understanding; there is a need to raise awareness.

The shared understanding raise awareness reflects the creation of a common cause as the need to raise awareness originates in the collective identity that women are victims of an oppressing society. This collective identity is continuously co-created and reinforced by actors interaction and taking part in the movement and collaborate based on a perceived united “we”. This united “we” is reinforced by disregarding challenging statements; “Men angry at the hashtag #YesAllWomen need to shut up... are you are woman? Then what position are you in to say not all women are harassed?” (YAW-4, ref. 59 p. 8). This illustrates a community that reflects some level of group polarization, which through interactions endorsing the shared content and reciprocates the act of sharing potentially further reinforce the group polarization.

This idea is further substantiated in the ingroup tweets that not only depicts women as victims, but more precisely women as victims of misogyny e.g. in tweets like “Because we sugar coat the subject as ‘violence against women’ when it should be ‘men’s violence against women’. #YesAllWomen” (YAW-4, ref. 9 p. 5). This illustrates how the creation of the united “we” engages the actors in co-creation of the need to raise awareness. This leads to the creation of a collective identity that inspires the articulation of the personalized action frames that defined the personal stories into collective action frames, reflecting the constructing of a united “we”.
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Raising awareness is also identified as a shared understanding within the community based on the use of the word “because”, which is the third most used word being used 975 times, only “to” and of course the hashtag “#YesAllWomen” was used more. This illustrates that the actors interacting and collaborating justifies their contributions, and argues that they are justified; “Because we live in a society…” (YAW-1, ref. 122 p. 25) and “Because people worry more…” (YAW-1, ref. p. 28). Every single contribution to the #YesAllWomen-hashtag empowered the rest and raised awareness, and all this took place through a self-organizing chorus of personal stories that sought to raise awareness, illustrating the influence of logic of connective action. This is further substantiated by the data that shows that 1618 of the 2110 contributions were from unique actors.

4.1.4 Summary
In summary the #YesAllWomen-movement reflects characteristics from both logics of action. This is seen in how the interactions reflects the self-organizing DNA, and use of personalized action frames identified in connective action and the collective co-creation of a common cause which leads to the construction of a united “we” as identified in collective action. This influence the co-creation of the shared understandings:

1. Personal stories were found to reflect connective action through the self-motivating act of sharing in the search for validation based on the use of personalized action frames. The personal stories were also found to act as a vehicle for co-creation and collaboration as well as potentially inspire trust in the community and interpersonal relations leading to the creation of stronger ties.

2. Collaboration was identified in the collective forging of a common cause, which inspired the creation of a collective identity, a united “we”, which induced further trust in the community and inspired collaboration towards social change based on the idea that a joint effort leads to a better outcome.

3. Raise awareness reflects the common cause that based on collective identity framing and the articulation of personalized action frames into collective action frames inspired by the shared understanding Collaboration. Raise awareness is dependent on the united “we” as it empowers the individual actors and encourage engagement in co-creation.
4.2 #BlackLivesMatter

4.2.1 Introduction

The Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement is an international activist movement, originating in the African-American community most prominent in the USA. The movement is a loosely-coordinated international movement that campaigned against violence towards black people as well as seeking social change regarding racism and equality. The movement began in 2013 after the acquittal of George Zimmerman in the shooting death of African-American teenager Trayvon Martin (Day, 2015), when a labor organizer named Alicia Garza responded to this acquittal on Facebook in an impassioned online message that ended with: "Black people. I love you. I love us. Our lives matter” (Day, 2015; Stephen, 2015).

The use of #BlackLivesMatter started in 2013, but it wasn’t until late 2014 that the movement matured and the hashtag #BlackLivesMatter started to raise awareness and gained nationwide as well as international recognition (Freelon et al., 2016). A key moment occurred on the 24th of November when a grand jury decided not to indict Darren Wilson in the killing of Michael Brown (Freelon et al., 2016) which resulted in the spike mentioned in the data collection-section. The #BlackLivesMatter-hashtag has been used over 4 million times in 2014 and 2015 (Freelon et al., 2016). The movement has been most prominent in USA where it #BlackLivesMatter has inspired rallies and protest nationwide and has raised awareness through multiple millions of tweets.

4.2.1.1 Impact

In USA the movement was ratified in January 2015 when the American Dialect Society declared #BlackLivesMatter their Word of the year (Day, 2015), and 2015 TIME Magazine put Black Lives Matter as number four and runner up in naming the Person of the year (Altman, 2016).

The movement has further had an impact by influencing the political agenda for the 2016 presidential campaign in USA (Cobb, 2016), as well as inspiring protests, rallies and gatherings. It is difficult to ascertain the role of the specific #BlackLivesMatter hashtag, but #BlackLivesMatter has certainly played a role in enabling emerging networks of individuals to connect and communicate, before, during and after these rallies, as well as in-between.

4.2.1.2 Criticism

There are two major themes of the criticism, which also are reflected in the 4,5% tweets found to disagree with the movement as well as second hand data:
4.2.1.2.1 Black Lives Matter versus All Lives Matter
The BLM-movement is criticized for only being concerned with black lives and how black matter instead of focusing on that all lives matter. This was also seen in the #YesAllWomen-movement and reflects how a specific focus often will result in disagreement by actors not part of the specific segment.

4.2.1.2.2 Black people are a bigger threat to black people than authorities
The movement is further criticized for hypocrisy based on statistics that illustrates how a black person is 25 times more likely to be killed by another black person than a white person (Top Right News, 2015). The argument is therefore criticizing the foundation of the movement and points out the dissonance that apparently black lives only matter when they are killed by authorities.

4.2.2 Findings
This first section will describe the findings, categories and other interesting findings from the coded tweets. The next section will develop these findings further in a more in-depth analysis of how these interactions reflects the logics of action and how these influence the co-creation of communities.
4.2.2.1 Raise awareness (BLM-1, appendix 10, CD)

The first major category represents tweets that seek to raise awareness. These are the diverse tweets that aim to create awareness about the persistence of the experienced issue. This category consists of tweets quoting famous – often black – individuals, links to relevant news articles and statements regarding the situation that black people experience. This type of tweets is often just an image, link or quote and the #BlackLivesMatter hashtag, no personal comments or remarks. In this category tweets regarding future happenings and events are also found as they seek to raise awareness about events. The large amount of event-advertising and links to news articles results in a large amount of neutral tweets (64.5%) with the rest relatively even spread.

4.2.2.1.1 Examples of tweets

- "Akai Gurley and Tamir Rice. Two names you should know. #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-1, ref. 2 p. 20)
- "#BlackLivesMatter The People Must Know before they can act....Ida B. Wells” (BLM-1, ref. 256 p 39)

4.2.2.2 Offline activism (BLM-2, appendix 11, CD)

The second category of coded tweets contains tweets that describe or reference offline activism and often contain images or videos from rallies, protests or “die-in’s”. These tweets also seek to raise awareness, but do it by reporting live from protests and about where the protests are moving. These tweets differentiate from raising awareness by either “reporting” from events or supporting those who went instead of raising awareness about their existence. This again results in a large amount of neutral tweets...
(68.8%). This category does however also contain a relevant amount of supportive tweets (15.6%) supporting those who take action and participate in these rallies. It is also relevant to mention that 59.7% of the tweets in this category are from the 13th of December 2014, which correlates with date chosen for its potential to showcase the use of Twitter during the multiple simultaneous protests across America.

4.2.2.2.1 Examples of tweets
- “So proud of my friends in @GWUPSU and @GWRoosevelt for their protest today in Kogen. #GWFerguson #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-2, ref. 60 p. 24)
- “Standing on 16th St with our friends and kids, vigil for racial justice. #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-2, ref. 82 p. 6)

4.2.2.3 Anti authorities (BLM-3, appendix 12, CD)
This group of tweets is more specifically targeted at police brutality and seeks to raise awareness by arguing that police are “pigs” (BLM-3, ref. 81 p. 14) and the cause of this issue. This is a more aggressive than reactive approach to the experienced issue specifically targeted at police than the generalizing statements found in the raise awareness-category. Tweets in this category are however not only targeted at police, as some of the tweets challenge the narrative shared in mainstream media as well. The offensive-value is dominating this category with 36.5%, however this category shows a more widespread account of different values, as the negative affective value (25.4%) also represents in a relevant amount of the tweets.

4.2.2.3.1 Examples of tweets
- “43 cops died in line of fire 2012. By contrast, here’s over 90 killer cops for November this year. #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-3, ref. 4 p. 1)
- “So when cops approached #TamirRice they didn’t realize a CHILD can be subdued w/out bullets? #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-3, ref. 9 p. 8)
4.2.2.4 Victimization (BLM-4, appendix 13, CD)

These tweets seek to raise awareness about issues of racism still persisting in America, rather than raising awareness about the movement. Here some of the tweets regarding police brutality can also be found, as some were focused more on how black people are the victims, than how police are the perpetrators. Tweets in this category reflect almost equal amounts of defensive (27.3%), negative (29.5%) and offensive (30.5%) tweets. Reflecting a diverse range of negative emotions found in these tweets.

4.2.2.4.1 Examples of tweets

- "History proves that they have always been valued least So please acknowledge #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-4, ref. 36 p. 3)
- "It’s so sad to hear about Tamir Rice. Black children don’t get to be treated like children. #blacklivesmatter” (BLM-4, ref. 10 p. 6)

4.2.2.5 Collaboration (BLM-5, appendix 14, CD)

This category represents the tweets that seek to either raise awareness or social change through collaboration. They acknowledge the importance of collaboration by sharing relevant links, discussing protests tactics, sharing guidelines for “white allies” or start general discussions about how to raise awareness or how to move forward. In sharp contrast to the victimization category, tweets in the collaboration category are dominated by the neutral (32%), positive (19.8%) and supportive (43.5%) values, illustrating how tweets in this category are focused on supporting other actors, sharing relevant and interesting pieces of
information and through joint effort seek a greater good.

4.2.2.5.1 Examples of tweets
- “#BlackLivesMatter protests are heating up across the US But which protest tactics are most effective?” (BLM-5, ref. 15 p. 2)
- “It’s time we discuss how to get involved in moving forward. Join us, CAPSU, and LAL tomorrow! #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-5, ref. 10 p. 7)

4.2.2.6 Other relevant findings

4.2.2.6.1 Other hashtags
The tweets often contain a name of one of the victims as a hashtag: “#AkaiGurley” (82), “#MikeBrown” (81), “#EricGarner” (46) and “#TamirRice” (44), are some of the most used names, while “#Ferguson” (416), “#ICantBreathe” (67) and “#HandsUpDontShoot” (39) are the most used hashtags referencing other parts of the BLM-movement.

4.2.2.6.2 Links
A lot of the tweets contain links of some sort, this is reflected in the data that shows “http” (723) and “https” (65) being mentioned in 38,4% of the tweets.

4.2.3 In-depth analysis of #BlackLivesMatter

4.2.3.1 Connective action
There is no formal organization, reflecting self-organizing DNA based on technology as the organizing agent. This is seen in the large amount of tweets seeking to raise awareness in conjunction with the tweets from offline activism that illustrate how every actor takes part in co-creating the movement by either supporting the cause with arguments, e.g. “Houston hasn’t indicted since 2004 #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-1, ref. 78 p. 6), sharing articles or contributing by either starting or sharing events, or in general support the actions of others and re-tweet or like their contribution. This also illustrates the impact of the act of sharing, as these actions are defined by the self-motivating dimension of participation, as sharing content, recognizing others
and thereby reciprocating the *act of sharing* is integral to the movements, especially seen in the *collaboration* tweet. This illustrates how technology act as the organizing agent connecting fragmented actors into large-scale dynamic networks.

The way that social media is utilized illustrates another key finding within the movement that reflects the *logic of connective action*. The *black lives matter*-movement is often compared to the movements of the 1960s lead by Martin Luther King and Malcolm X (Stephen, 2015). However, the *black lives matter*-movement differentiates from the movements defined by these iconic leaders in a crucial aspect, as in the *black lives matter*-movement there is no leaders and no formal organization. The movement is leaderless and decentralized, defined by individuals organizing themselves in these large-scale fluid networks facilitated by the organizing ability of the technology. The movement is therefore dependent on a large crowd, and reflects the more fluid polycentric democracy with multiple authority structures as seen in NSMs (Fenton, 2008), “You ALL are capable of leading and organizing. Keep the passion going ...” (BLM-5, ref. 30 p. 9). This argues that the movement is dependent on different individuals that step up and ‘speak up’, thus taking on a leading role, potentially inspiring others. This can be identified in the large amount of actors seeking to *raise awareness* or promote *offline activism*, as these actions occur through DNA, without formal organizations. This again illustrates the impact of technology through social media’s dependence on the *act of sharing*.

The *logic of connective action* is further reflected in how *memes* and *personalized action frames* is used in the *act of sharing*. This is illustrated by different movements that emerged on Twitter for example #IfTheyGunnedMeDown, which is a hashtag that started trending after Mike Brown was shot in Ferguson, and the media originally used a picture of him that can be interpreted as *flashing* a ‘gang sign’ (NBC News (@NBCNews), 2014). #IfTheyGunnedMeDown illustrates the use of *personalized action frames* as actors through the hashtag shared pictures of themselves asking the question which one that would be chosen if they were shot in the streets, thereby utilizing the power of a *meme* as it is open for interpretation and translation across boundaries, and provided another way of *raising awareness*.

### 4.2.3.2 Collective action

The movement connects and unites actors based on the shared understanding that there is an injustice that needs to be challenged through collaboration. As seen in the tweets categorized as *victimization* and *anti-authorities*, as they both reflect a clear identity, a shared belief in a narrative where black people identify themselves as victims, e.g. illustrated by the tweet “As blacks we could
go out here tonight holdings hands singing “kum ba yah my lord” and still be deemed dangerous #Ferguson #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-4, ref. 26 p. 13) or “I wish I was surprised or shocked. I’m sorry this country does not value black lives. #Ferguson #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-4, ref. 27 p. 13).

In order to achieve this, social media played a crucial role through its mediating ability, as it enabled the connection of fragmented stories under the “banner” #BlackLivesMatter. The movement is therefore defined through its ability to connect actors and inspire collaboration that illustrate how these isolated incidents are not combined, thus utilizing the power in numbers, and collectively forging a common cause. This can for instance be identified by the use of the aforementioned memes, which showcase an example of the injustice that black people experience. These memes are used by actors to, through personalized action frames, raise awareness about their experiences, which then becomes an integrated part of the black lives matter-movement. These isolated personalized action frames are then articulated into a collective action frame based on the united “we” as co-creation through the collectively forged a common cause, which illustrates the influence of collective action. This process of articulating personalized action frame into collective action frames also illustrates how co-creation, based on the collective forging of a common cause also potentially inspired the co-creation of a collective identity based on specific values and a shared belief in the shared narrative.

This is especially illustrated by how the #BlackLivesMatter-hashtag saw a huge spike in activity after the shootings in Ferguson and Baltimore (Freelon et al., 2016) These shootings were no longer isolated incidents, they illustrated the central narrative of the movement; “stop killings us” (Freelon et al., 2016), which based on the articulation of personalized action frames inspired the co-creation of a collective victim identity, and by connecting these events they had a greater impact than they would have had isolated. This can also be identified in the Offline activism category that reflects how isolated protests, “die-in’s” and vigils around the world, through the use of technology as an organizing agent are connected. This illustrates the collective identity, a united “we” that empowers the individual by being part of a collective. The movement is at the same time also empowered by all these contributions that collectively increase reach and reinforcing the collective identity through co-creation. This is also where group polarization can be identified, as the fragmented actors interacting, are drawn together by the shared belief in the narrative. This group polarization might help fuel the movement, but it might also enforce the creation of a deliberate enclave.
4.2.3.3 The community

The following section identifies some of the major co-created shared understandings, influenced by *logics of action* that constitute the community. The shared understandings are identified by investigating how the *logics of action* influence the engagement with and co-creation of these online communities.

4.2.3.3.1 Victimization

Reflecting on findings and the creation of a shared “we” identifies the *victimization* as an embedded shared understanding, illustrated by the strong, sharp and visual narrative and common cause; “stop killing us” (Freelon et al., 2016). This is substantiated by the large amount of tweets found the categories *victimization* and *anti-authorities*, as well a substantial amount of the *raise awareness*, “When will it become a crime in America for whites to kill, rape, mame, shoot, & bomb black people? #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-4, ref. 25 p. 13). “Stop killing us” is a clear and significant message that enables actors in weak-tied networks to forge a common cause, construct a united “we” and collectively seek social change, illustrating the influence of *collective action*. This shared understanding is co-created and shared through the interactions where actors support and confirm each other; “Black people – no matter what happens, know that you ARE important. I love you all #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-5, ref. 20 p. 6), “I've been wanting this unity amongst the African American community at UT for so long and I almost shed tears! #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-5, ref. 19 p. 8).

This constitutes an emergent and dynamic community, defined by the actors that voluntary chose to use the hashtag and engage in co-creation of the common cause and the collective identity. This reflects the motivation of *collective action*, where actors collectively forge a common cause, and in conjunction with the *act of sharing* acts as motivation for actors to interact. At the same time is the motivation for, and level of, participation is individually defined, motivated by the idea that the joint effort of many leads to a better outcome than anyone could achieve individually (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009).

This shared and embedded understanding is crucial for the community (and movement), as it increases *homophily*. This influences the level of trust induced by the community, and as the literature review suggests, it is possible to maintain trust in a community as a whole, which is relevant seeing the large amount of interactions that are primarily with the community as a whole, and not isolated individuals. The high level of collaboration illustrates that the interpersonal level to a certain degree is irrelevant, as it is the notions of shared understandings that drives online
homophily (Brown et al., 2007). This is however also seen to reflect levels of *group polarization* as opposing opinions are disregarded; “Sick of claims of diff “opinions” in this “debate”. Police brutality that goes unpunished & racial violence AREN’T DEBATES #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-3, ref. 13 p. 1).

4.2.3.3.2 Raising awareness

The shared understanding of being victims and forging a common cause leads to the creation of another shared understanding; the need to *raise awareness* that is integral to the movement.

#BlackLivesMatter is about speaking up against the injustice, black people all over USA experience, it is about telling the world “stop killing us”. This narrative represents the common cause collectively forged based on continuous interactions and collaboration. It is the issue that black people experience and the initial motivation for interacting and engaging in collective collaboration, “We all bleed the same color #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-1, ref. 274 p. 66) or “The change we want to see starts with us ...” (BLM-1, ref. 304 p. 69). The movement’s actions and the need to *raise awareness* is therefore a response to the world they experience, where the movement members perceive themselves as victims that need to *raise awareness* against the injustice they experience “Everyday I’m reminded this system isn’t broke, it was built this way. Love my people who take it apart brick by brick #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-4, ref. 37 p. 14), again illustrating the importance of forging a common cause and a united “we”.

The shared understanding of raising awareness is at the same time influenced by *logic of connective action* seeing how mediating technologies enables actors to engage in co-creation and functions as an organizing agent of the actors seeking to *raise awareness*. This is identified in the large part of both the *raising awareness* and *offline activism*-tweets that reflect how actors in real time, point out contradictions between the eyewitness and police reports on Twitter (Day, 2015), relay the protests movements or updates for those who follow the movement online. This is important as (Freelon et al., 2016) finds; “that most people paying attention to BLM online were more interested in consuming information and participating digitally than in offline participation” (Freelon et al., 2016 p 84). The way social media is utilized is therefore an integral part of the movement, as it allows and encourages members of the movement to ‘speak up’, based on either *personal* or *collective action frames* depending on the actor.

The aspect of real life activism makes BLM further interesting, as the large amount of tweets illustrating *offline activism*, showcase that raising awareness is a collaborative effort defined by voluntary self-motivating participation, as actors often either take part in *offline activism* or
support them. This process of raising awareness also illustrates the influence of *connective action* through the self-organizing nature of the community defined by individuals organizing, and *raising awareness* for these sporadic events rather than formal organizations, “Obviously, just back from my local #BlackLivesMatter demo. Small but very impassioned, loud, chanting at the police station” (BLM-2, ref. 172 p. 13), “#BlackLivesMatter protest going on in my neighborhood tonight” (BLM-2, ref. 72 p. 5).

However these events take place due to the creation of a common cause that motivates actors to take action. These *offline activism*-tweets can therefore also illustrate that is not just a “mental construct” that exists in the minds of members, it is a collaborative project where a large amount of actors engage and take action, thus creating social ties through interactions. Some of these actors who take action are more committed, through actively taking part in offline events, where the shared understanding and collective identity is reinforced and potentially also leads to the creation of stronger ties between the actors taking part, reflecting *the logic of collective action*. This is further seen in how the community, in some cases defines some sort of boundary seeing how there is “guidelines for white allies” illustrating some sort of restricted access. This is however primarily seen in *offline activism*, as the online community is defined by unrestricted access due to the nature of hashtags.

**4.2.3.3.3 Connecting the fragmented**

The concept of *leaderless movements*, defined and co-created by a large-scale network of individuals, illustrates how the BLM-movement succeed in connecting a vast amount of fragmented actors and contexts into large-scale networks. This is reflected in the shared understanding; the value of mediating solidarity between fragmented actors and *connecting the fragmented*.

This is identified in the creation of these smaller, more time-limited and contextualized movements that emerged as trending hashtags like #IfTheyGunnedMeDown that is based on the use of *memes* and more *personalized action frames* that inspired actors to interact, share and engage in co-creation, as well as helped to raise awareness by continuously taking part in co-creating the movement and keep the discussion for social change timely. These *memes* are further important through their ability to communicate content that is open for interpretation and more easily can travel across diverse boundaries (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), illustrated by the relatively large amount of tweets containing other hashtags, which all are connected to a greater cause through social media e.g. "We are all #Ferguson! #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-5, ref. 18 p. 8). These are all a result of the connecting ability of technology and a product of the *logic of connective action* that
interestingly emerged from a common cause illustrating that it is not only the articulation of personalized action frames into collective identities, personalized action frames can also be created based on a common cause. This is important as actors are more encouraged to focus on short term and rapidly shifting issues rather than fully fledged ideologies (Fenton, 2008).

The collaboration and collective effort is therefore crucial in order for the movement to have an impact and achieve social change e.g. “Do you want to help #StopRacism? Then RT & sign now…” (BLM-5, ref. 14 p. 5) illustrating how social media is used to raise awareness and collaborate, through its ability to connect previously isolated actors from all around the world. Connecting the fragmented is therefore about becoming a part of something greater, and thus empowering the individuals through a collective by raising awareness based on the mediating ability of social media, “We here we are united #BlackLivesMatter” (BLM-5, ref. 42 p. 9).

4.2.4 Summary
The black lives matter-movement illustrates the influence of logics of action, by how connective action can be seen in the self-organizing nature of the leaderless movement and the use of personalized action frames to engage in rapidly shifting issues. This engagement with rapidly shifting issue was at the same time identified as influential in the co-creation of a united “we”, by articulating personalized action frames into a collective identity based on the strong narrative; “stop killing us”. The #BlackLivesMatter became a collective, a banner that combined more contextualized movements by collectively forging a common cause. These logics influence the co-creation of three different, but intertwined shared understandings. These shared understandings are by no means exhaustive but represent integral shared understandings that constitute the online community.

1. Victimization is defined by voluntary participation of individuals that based on experiences engage in co-creation and collectively forge a common cause based on the narrative “stop killing us”. This leads to the construction of a united “we” that increase homophily and in certain cases leads to group polarization.

2. Raise awareness is based on the victimization and illustrate the self-organizing nature of actors in order to collaborate and co-create a common cause. Raise awareness is also reflecting in the offline activism, as these events illustrate commitment by some community members as well as illustrate the collaborative effort of endorsing each other online based on the need to raise awareness.
3. The ability to connect the fragmented represents the ability for the movement to mediate solidarity between fragmented actors and the ability for the BLM-movement to act as a banner for other more time-limited and contextualized movements. This shared understanding is also found to inspire the creation of memes and more personalized communication content based on the common cause and mediating ability of social media.

4.3 #IceBucketChallenge

4.3.1 Introduction

The ALS Ice bucket challenge is a social media movement that went viral during the summer of 2014. The purpose was to raise awareness and donations for ALS, also known as Lou Gehrig’s disease (Alsa.org, 2016a). The origin of the challenge itself is unclear and has been attributed to many sources. The movement is based on actors nominating each other to donate to the ALS Association, and went viral due to actors sharing videos of “doing the challenge”, which is dumping a bucket of ice water over your head to opt out of donating money. The movement spread due to the nature of nominating, as completing the challenge by either donating or doing the challenge enabled you to nominate others, who then was “required” to either donate or do the challenge (some did both). This reflects the social norms (Ostrom, 1999) embedded within the movement. Data suggests that in the period between June 1st – September 1st of 2014 the Ice Bucket Challenge generated about 15.5 million mentions on twitter (Ton, 2015), with over 4 million of those containing the #IceBucketChallenge-hashtag (Ridley, 2014; Splashscore.com, 2014)

It is important to note that the ALS Association (Alsa.org, 2016b) did not start or organize the movement but joined in, taking responsibility for directing efforts, sharing relevant information and made real-time updates of how the movement progressed.

4.3.1.1 Impact

The movement had an impact through raising awareness about the ALS disease and motivating donations. The movement raised $115 million in the two months, July – August 2014 that the movement peaked virally (Alsa.org, 2016c). This capital was invested in a wide array of different projects, community services, education and further fundraising (Alsa.org, 2016c),

4.3.1.2 Criticism

The movement naturally received an amount of criticism. The criticism is based on themes that are identified in both the second hand data as well as in the 3% of the tweets categorized as disagreement.
4.3.1.2.1 Wasting drinking water
The movement is criticized for wasting a large amount of drinking water. This criticism originates from arguments stating that a lot of countries would have benefitted greatly from the water and that awareness could have been raised without wasting water. The movement peaked during a drought in California which increased this criticism.

4.3.1.2.2 Importance of the cause
It is also argued that there are more acute causes and issues in the world that needs support and funding, and that the ALS Ice bucket challenge cannibalized on the funding that other research projects could have received.

4.3.1.2.3 Lack of focus
It became more of a “fun”, trending challenge than actually about raising awareness. A poll conducted by WHO (Rt.com, 2014) showed that 98% of the people who took the challenge still don’t know what ALS is. A part of this criticism also argues that doing the challenge became more of an unrelated action, and argued of the paradox in doing the challenge for charity as a way of avoiding having to donate money.

4.3.2 Findings
The first section will describe the findings of the quantitative study, what characterizes the categories, examples of tweets and other potential interesting findings from the coded tweets, followed by a more in-depth investigation that will develop these findings.

![Figure 17: Categories of #IceBucketChallenge tweets](image-url)
4.3.2.1 Raising awareness (ALS-1, appendix 15, CD)

The first major category defines tweets that seek to raise awareness about the challenge and ALS in general, which accounts for 40% of the collected tweets. The majority (67%) of tweets found here are videos of others doing the challenge, as in actors sharing videos of other actors doing the challenge, often celebrities. The rest of the tweets in this category are either shared articles often related to what marketers can learn from the movement, information about the movement in general for example the amount of money donated or information about ALS. The *neutral* value is dominating the tweets in the raising awareness category with 62,6% of the tweets, while the *positive value* is the second most identified at 15,8%.

4.3.2.1.1 Examples of tweets
- "Commissioner Gary Bettman took the #IceBucketChallenge! [link] (ALS-1, ref. 99 p. 8)
- "WATCH: @BonJovi takes the #IceBucketChallenge ... with help fro @GovCHristie [link] #ChrisChristie" (ALS-1, ref. 16 p. 24)

4.3.2.2 Personal stories (ALS-2, appendix 16, CD)

The second major category consists of the tweets that represent a personal story either through text, or actors sharing videos/images of doing the challenge and nominating others. This category accounts for 34,6% of the collected tweets, with 73,6% of these tweets being actors sharing a video of doing the challenge or writing about doing it. This type of tweet will often contain a link to another site where the video of the challenge is found. Again it is found that the *neutral* value is dominating by accounting for 70% of the tweets, followed by the *positive value* representing 14,5%. The large amount of neutral tweets is due to the nature of the tweets following an often used template; reference to the original nominator, nominating others and a link to a video or image of the nominated doing the challenge without further remarks.

![Figure 18: Affective values #IceBucketChallenge – Raising awareness](image)
4.3.2.2.1 Examples of tweet
- “I accepted the ALS #icebucketchallenge. I nominate Mitchell Wayne Jackson Ryan Tracy Michael Nick... http://fb.me/3gQEK3Eps” (ALS-2, ref. 3 p. 1)
- “Thanks @brittneygullo.. I nominate _katiebabiee_ @jjjjjill and @taquitojackson #als #icebucketchallenge http://instagram.com/p/rsmGJum5QU/” (ALS-2, ref. 107 p. 8)

4.3.2.3 Collaboration (ALS-3, appendix 17, CD)
The last of the relevant categories contains the tweets that seek collaboration between actors taking part in the movement for example by nominating individuals or seeking collaborative effort. This segment represents 11% of the tweets. It can also be argued that the concept of nominating others as part of the challenge also seeks collaboration. The tweets identified were found to be primarily offensive (45,2%), as they actively sought to inspire or encourage others, either by challenging, seeking collaboration or starting a discussion. The rest of the tweets were either neutral (19%), positive (17,1%) or supportive (17,6%).

4.3.2.3.1 Examples of tweets
- “Who wants to get nominated? Fav if yes #Icebucketchallenge” (ALS-3, ref. 17 p. 2)
- “Join me in the fight again #ALS. #Icebucketchallenge and make a donation. You have 24 hrs!” (ALS-3, ref. 47 p. 4)
4.3.2.4 Other relevant findings

4.2.3.4.1 Links
Looking at the word frequency of the tweets illustrate a tight link to other social media or websites, representing an intertwined network of social media seeing how “http” (812), “com” (625), “Instagram” (244), “www” (188) and “youtu” (179) all can be found in the top ten most used words over three letters.

4.2.3.4.2 Social norms
As to be assumed the aspect of challenging, accepting and nominating also represent a relevant amount of the most used word, as “challenge” (228), “nominate” (141), “nominated” (99), “accepted” (92) and “challenged” (71) are some of the most used words illustrating the social norms of the challenge and what it entails.

4.3.3 In-depth analysis of #IceBucketChallenge

4.3.3.1 Connective action
DNA is at the core of this movement, as the ALS Ice bucket challenge started by and gained viral status through emergent DNA without a specific starting point. This is possible through the organizing nature of technological affordances that enables these large-scale fluid networks, where contribution is defined by self-motivation and self-organizing actors. Everyone could potentially challenge everyone, which the data also reflects; “My 9 year old nephew just challenged @PMHarper to the #IceBucketChallenge. What do you say, Mr. Prime Minister? …” (ALS-2, ref. 125 p. 25). These interactions illustrate the self-organizing nature of the weak-tied network as it is more important for the actors to be part of the large-scale network than embedded in groups. These tweets also illustrate how nature of nominating and challenging is not bounded by proximity or close relations illustrating the weak-tied structure of the network; “SOMEONE NOMINATE @katyperry PLEASE to #Icebucketchallenge #project ALS” (ALS-3, ref. 60 p.15).
The self-organizing nature of DNA illustrates how technology is integral to the success of this movement, both as an organizing agent as well as how challenges can be transferred and communicated without regard for geographical and cultural boundaries illustrating the space of flows. This is seen in how Doing the challenge became a meme, an easily transferable and customizable message that allowed for different interpretations and thus allowed a wide group of actors to support it. The formative element of 'sharing' and the reciprocation of this, the linchpin of connective action, is therefore also integral to the success of the movement.

This resulted in interactions defined by the act of sharing and how this act is reciprocated. Sharing, diffusing and endorsing content is therefore important aspects of the movement, and the data also illustrates how certain individuals became more focused on sharing themselves doing the challenge and receiving endorsement for their shared content, than raising awareness or money for ALS, e.g. "If this tweet has 10 RT I will do the #IceBucketChallenge" (ALS-3, ref. 75 p. 10) or "13 more favs and @Austin_Shef and I are doing the #IceBucketChallenge naked" (ALS-3, ref. 14 p. 11). This also reflects the criticism of the movement.

It is however difficult to separate when the DNA became chaotic and unfocused, as doing the challenge undoubtedly helped raise awareness, and thus pursuing self-interests might have helped the movement as well. It is therefore argued that whether or not it is intended, interactions using the hashtag #IceBucketChallenge do contribute to the common good by raising awareness, illustrating the argument that actors pursuing their self-interests often seem to instinctively move collectively (Schneckenberg, 2009). It is therefore a possibility that doing the challenge for some became more of taking part in a trend, but as the data takes outset in #IceBucketChallenge tweets, the data is assumed to illustrate actors who utilizes personalized action frames to self-validate and based on personal arguments or ideas take part in these large-scale fluid networks defined by the hashtag.

The impact of personalized action frames is seen in the amount of tweets shared with a personal interpretation of the meme “doing the challenge” exemplified by the sharing videos or pictures of themselves (25,4%) or others (26,9%) doing the challenge in various ways, which show that over half of the collected tweets in some way or another referenced or directly used a personal action frame when interpreting the meme. This also illustrates the potential of a meme, as it is open for interpretation and everyone can personalize it and join, as well as being easily transferable and adapted in different contexts, easily travelling across large and diverse population.
4.3.3.2 Collective action

While the logic of connective action can be identified in the personalized action frames and the use of mediating technologies to organize the movement, the logic of collective action is identified in the forging of a common cause. The self-validation is identified as crucial, however the forging of a common cause is also identified in the movement. This notion can be identified throughout the tweets as “als” and “#als” can be found in 24.3% of the tweets, as well as the repeating argument that “if you are doing the #Icebucketchallenge without actually donating any money to ALS then you are just looking for attention” (ALS-1, ref. 19 p. 24), arguing that this is about more than just self-validation, and that a part of the actors participating engage in co-creation of a common cause. This common cause is therefore crucial for the viral success of the movement as it function as motivation and inspires actors to do the challenge and nominate others to reciprocate this act. This is tightly intertwined with the formative element of sharing as the act of sharing is based upon the common cause that is collectively created through co-creation.

Seeing how doing the challenge is part of contributing to the common cause, it can also be argued that some sort of boundary is created, as doing the challenge or donating money requires deliberate action and therefore some sort of commitment by the actors. This does not contradict the earlier argument, that everyone can join the movement, but there is commitment, as the large-scale fluid network is primarily constituted by actors committing themselves and taking action. Actors were however found to circumvent this commitment by e.g. nominating others without completing the challenge, and thus “breaking” the social norm, as it is seen in the data ”#IceBucketChallenge I nominate @JodiAnnArias” (ALS-3, ref. 24 p. 7) or “I want someone to nominate Ian and Nina for the #IceBucketChallenge” (ALS-3, ref. 26 p. 7).

This again illustrates how it is possible to nominate everyone, and on a macro-scale the movement reflects characteristics of a large-scale network defined by weak-tied individuals. However, studying isolated interactions illustrates the potential for stronger ties to be formed, and also reflect how a large part of the nominations are a result of stronger ties as seen in ”@nickdiaz209 let’s go bro! You have been called out for the ALS #IceBucketChallenge it’s all for a good cause! ...” (ALS-2, ref. 169 p. 13) or “All my friends should be on standby. Hmmmmmm….. Who will I challenge? #IceBucketChallenge” (ALS-2, ref. 193 p. 15) both illustrating more than a weak-tied connection.

Based on the findings of forging a common cause and a movement defined by stronger commitments, it could be presumed that some sort of collective identity would emerge. This can
however not be identified in the data. The word “We” that should symbolize a united “we” is only
mentioned 84 times, which compared to the amount of times a personal pronoun is used; “I”
(477), “You” (259), “Me” (163) and “My” (158) argue that personalized action frames are
dominant. It is therefore interesting how the common cause is co-created, and to what extent it is
defined by active engagement in collective co-creation based on shared values or actors
instinctively moving collectively when pursuing their self-interests.

4.3.3.3 The community
The following section investigates how the logics of action influence the engagement with and co-
creation of some of the shared understandings that constitute a community.

4.3.3.3.1 Raising awareness
As argued some sort of common cause is co-created within the movement. This common cause is
identified as need to raise awareness, which is argued to be a shared understanding within the
community. This can be seen in the purpose of the movement; raising awareness and money for
ALS, as well as in the data seeing that 40% of the tweets are found in the category raising
awareness, and the relation to the ALS Association is seen in the use of the words “als” and “#als”
as argued earlier. This is also reflected in the tweets “The awareness that the
#IceBucketChallenge is raising for ALS is amazing! What a fantastic idea!” (ALS-1, ref. 287 p. 21)
or as argued in “If you think the ALS #IceBucketChallenge is all about pop”ularity and not
awareness you need to read this article …” (ALS-1, ref. 23 p. 2). The shared understanding of the
need to raise awareness is further co-created by “defending” the movement; “The
#IceBucketChallenge brought more awareness to the disease and raised more money than last
year Right? Ok then SHUTUP” (ALS-1, ref. 8 p. 43), arguing for the importance in raising
awareness. The importance of awareness is also shared through collaboration and support as
illustrated by “@coslive thanks for doing. The
more awareness for ALS the better. #IceBucketChallenge” (ALS-1, ref. 202 p. 15).

However in order for this common cause of social change to be achieved, actors interacting and
sharing content is crucial. The connective action and the act of sharing is therefore integral in the
co-creation of this shared understanding as doing the challenge isolated has no relevance. In order
to comply to the social norms of completing the challenge it has to be shared in a public space,
forcing every isolated actor to co-contribute to the process of raising awareness, as the
affordances of social media links every isolated contribution through the #IceBucketChallenge-
hashtag, and thus, every single act of sharing, whether it is intended or not adds to the common
cause and raise awareness. The purposefully intention to *raise awareness* can however be identified in the data, substantiating the claim of *raising awareness* being a shared understanding within the community; “Our brave soon-to-be wet! Team is doing the #IceBucketchallenge to support ALS research tomorrow! ...” (ALS-1, ref. 285 p. 21).

The idea of the social norm that “nominating others” is a reward also illustrates how *raising awareness* is achieved through the nature of the challenge, as the greater amount of people *nominated*, the more awareness is generated. This also possesses the potential for starting a chain reaction of challenges and nominations, which in the end leads to more awareness.

### 4.3.3.3.2 Doing the challenge

The shared understanding of *raising awareness* is however not enough; “Hashtags raise awareness but they don’t solve anything. To do good you must DO something. #IceBucketChallenge ...” (ALS-1, ref. 219 p. 16). This leads to the next shared understanding; *doing the challenge*.

The importance of *doing the challenge* can be identified in the data that shows over half of the collected tweets represents themselves or others doing the challenge. The *personalized action frames*, as defined by *connective action*, are therefore found to be essential to the community as they constitute the shared understanding of *doing the challenge*, by providing a *meme* that every participating actor can interpret and translate as they wish.

The *act of sharing* can in conjunction with the common cause also be identified as a motivation for *doing the challenge*. This is again seen in how *doing the challenge* becomes a process of self-validation e.g. seen in how the *act of sharing* is integral, when the challenge is completed there is a need to share it e.g. “Did the #IceBucketChallenge! Check out the full video on FB!” (ALS-2, ref. 51 p. 20). This is also seen in how some actors take pride in actually donating; “I have officially been challenged for the #IceBucketChallenge. I have 24 hours to complete. I’m going to do it & give the $100 ...” (ALS-2, ref. 76 p. 22), illustrating the *personalized action frames*, as it is the personal motivation of self-validating by making a contribution. At the same time the common cause can be identified in other tweets, “I really hope all these rich people doing the #IceBucketChallenge are also donating to #ALS. Otherwise, what’s the point?” (ALS-2, ref. 53 p. 4).

The *act of sharing* is again integral as the process of nominating others and thereby inspiring others to do the challenge as argued can act as legitimization for *doing the challenge* and sharing
it e.g. “Can please someone nominate a SHINEe member at #IceBucketChallenge” (ALS-3, ref. 27 p 12) or “@tokiohotel we dare you to make the #IceBucketChallenge! :(...” (ALS-3, ref. 66 p. 15), both again reflecting the large-scale weak-tied structure of the movement. This legitimization is also found in how doing the challenge is endorsed; “My lovely fiancé did the #IceBucketChallenge...” (ALS-2, ref. 73 p. 21). The relevance of actors doing the challenge is further validated by actors that utilize the shared videos as content that can be re-shared in order to inspire co-creation and potentially inspire user-generated content. This is seen in tweets like: “Have you been nominated for the #ALS #IceBucketChallenge? Here are some tech executives’ videos: ...” (ALS-1, ref. 11 p. 1), which potentially lead to increased intellectual value of the community through the co-creation of content.

These examples illustrate how the importance of doing the challenge is co-created as a shared understanding and a way of utilizing personalized action frames to interpret the meme and join the movement, illustrating traces of connective action. Furthermore the movement is founded on the content that actors are motivated to share, which argues that without actors doing the challenge and sharing it with others, the movement would perish. Collective action can also be identified in how doing the challenge inspires stronger commitment by the participants, and seeing how nominations in theory require one to either donate or do the challenge in order to comply to the social norms.

4.3.3.3.3 Collaborative effort
The third of the identified shared understandings within the community is that achieving social change is a collaborative effort. This community is defined by the idea that philanthropy is no longer just a privilege of the elite, it is a joint effort and everyone can contribute to making social change. Everyone that shares content or contributes in other ways take part in the common cause; "I want 2 Thank Everyone who #IceBucketChallenge for ALS!! My Brother died 2 yrs ago from this awful disease! Thank U all!! xoxo (ALS-3, ref. 42 p. 8). The self-organizing nature is again relevant as it defines a large-scale fluid structure where everyone can engage in co-creation through interactions by doing the challenge or donating and thereby contributing.

The collaborative effort as a shared understanding is especially seen in the tweets reflecting the social norm of nominating. The process of nominating others can be identified in almost every tweet of an actor doing the challenge, and furthermore in tweets that seek to encourage others to join the movement based on personal reasons, illustrating the use of personalized action frames as the vehicle for collaboration. The shared understanding is naturally also identified in the
collaboration-tweets, where 45.2% is found to be offensive, which argues that nearly half of the tweets progressively seek collaboration by interacting with other actors. The nominations also illustrate an interpersonal relation, as the tweets often reference the nominator e.g. “I was nominated for the #ALS #Icebucketchallenge by izzzie_b. And now I’m calling out ...” (ALS-2, ref. 202 p. 31), illustrating how the interactions also possesses a potential for stronger ties to be forged. The diverse demography of actors represented in the tweets including children, adults and celebrities all doing the challenge illustrates how everyone can dump a bucket of ice water over their head or donate and take part in the collaborative project. Taking part in the collaborative effort also reflects traces of the logic of collective action, as the social norms requires some sort of commitment from the actors taking action, again it is worth noting that participants was seen to circumvent these requirements.

The collaborative effort is however not defined by construction of a united “we”, but through encouraging participation in the common cause based on more personalized action frames. The self-motivating act of sharing is therefore again relevant as it provides self-validation, by reflecting how doing the challenge contributes to the collaborative effort, which in turn provides legitimization. This is for example seen in how videos of doing the challenge that in some way incorporate a fun element is appreciated by the community “Britney’s #IceBucketChallenge is the BEST video EVER!” (ALS-1, ref. 23 p. 44), “Haha Ditka doing the #IceBucketChallenge with a cigar in his mouth!!” (ALS-1, ref. 87 p 7).

4.3.4 Summary

The ALS Ice bucket challenge reflects characteristics from both logics of action. The connective action is identified in the self-organizing nature of DNA and the large part of actors participating by doing the challenge, and in the pursuit of self-validation based on personalized action frames interpret, translate and co-create the shared understandings identified within the movement. At the same time collective action is identified in the, whether or not intended, forging of a common cause and potentially stronger ties forged through the social norm of nominating as well as the artificial boundary also defined by these social norms. These logics were found to influence the creation of these three shared understandings, which represent some of the shared values and ideas that constitute the community, these are however by no means exhaustive:

1. Raising awareness is integral to the movement as it enables the creation of a common cause, which in conjunction with the act of sharing motivates actors that through personalized action frames engage in co-creation.
2. *Doing the challenge* is based on the common cause and reflects the importance of the act of sharing and personalized action frames, as the community is constituted by actors interpreting, translated and sharing content, thereby complying to the social norms. The interpersonal relation is also relevant as it illustrates how shared content is endorsed and thereby act as legitimization, as well as reveal the potential for stronger ties to be forged.

3. *Collaboration* identifies a community dependent on co-creation and interactions, as social change is a joint effort arguing that philanthropy is not a privilege of the elite. The social norm of nominating identified direct collaborations and the act of sharing and how the nominations or shared content is reciprocated provide legitimization for the self-validating process of engaging in the collaborative effort.

**Part 5: Discussion**

The following section will conduct a comparison of the findings from the three cases. First the comparison will investigate how the interactions in the three social movements reflected the logics of collective and connective action, and then how these influence the co-creation of shared understandings that constitute online communities.

### 5.1 Findings

This study set out to investigate the research question:

- How are the logics of collective and connective action reflected in Twitter interactions and how do these define the engagement with and co-creation of shared understandings that constitute online communities?

This was done by conducting a netnographic study on three different cases by analyzing Twitter interactions shared using chosen hashtags. The data was analyzed based on a conducted literature review that reviewed theories discussing the logics of action, interactions and their impact of tie-creation as well as online communities. Based on the literature review and the data analysis characteristics from both the logic of collective and connective action were identified in the social media interactions and these characteristics were found to influence the engagement with and co-creation of shared understandings in various way.
5.1.1 The influence of the logics of action

The following framework refers back to the framework proposed (Framework 1), and identifies how the different characteristics of the two *logics of action* are reflected in the social media interactions by illustrating and comparing the findings.

*Framework 3: Identified characteristics of the logics of action in social media interactions (Author’s own)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework 3</th>
<th>#YesAllWomen</th>
<th>Black Lives Matter</th>
<th>ALS Ice Bucket Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Self-organizing DNA based on technology as an organizing agent inspiring a leaderless movement</td>
<td>Self-organizing DNA based on technology as an organizing agent inspiring a leaderless movement</td>
<td>Self-organizing DNA based on technology as an organizing agent inspiring a leaderless movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Large-scale fluid network defined by unrestricted network access and weak-tied interactions. Ties are generally forged with the movement as a whole however social relations and stronger ties, was also identified at the interpersonal level.</td>
<td>Large-scale fluid network defined by unrestricted access and weak-tied interactions. Ties are primarily forged with the movement as a whole, although some interpersonal ties were formed</td>
<td>Large-scale fluid network defined by unrestricted access and weak-tied interactions. Ties are primarily forged with the movement as a whole, however through the social norm of nominating actors was found to engage in tie-construction at the interpersonal level as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>The self-motivating <em>act of sharing</em> acted as self-validation and inspired voluntary participation. Over time through continuous interactions</td>
<td>The self-motivating <em>act of sharing</em> acted as self-validation and inspired voluntary participation. Over time through continuous interactions</td>
<td>The self-motivating <em>act of sharing</em> acted as self-validation and inspired voluntary participation. The social norm of nominating provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity framing</td>
<td>The creation of a common cause inspired the collective construction of a united “we” based on a shared belief in the narrative/cause. This led to the co-construction of a collective identity and some level of group polarization as homophily increased.</td>
<td>The creation of a common cause inspired the collective construction of a united “we” based on a shared belief in the narrative/cause. This led to the co-construction of a collective identity and some level of group polarization as homophily increased.</td>
<td>No construction of a united “we” was identified as the movement is primarily motivated by self-validation when participating in the common cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>No clear boundary or restricted access besides the forging of a common cause based on emotional experiences and seriousness of the issue which might require commitment if an actor adapts. Actors were however found to circumvent this requirement.</td>
<td>A form of commitment was required to join, either by participating in offline activism or by taking part in the collective co-creation of identity, thus through commitment require more a more self-changing social identity, actors were however found to circumvent this requirement.</td>
<td>The social norms require actors to take social action and commit themselves by either doing the challenge or donating. Actors were however found to circumvent this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicati</td>
<td>Personalized action frames</td>
<td>Personalized action frames</td>
<td>Personalized action frames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were clearly identified in the interactions and the self-motivating act of sharing illustrating the self-organizing nature. Over time and through continuous interactions these Personalized action frames were articulated into Collective action frames based on the collective identity.

were again clearly identified in the movement as the self-motivating act of sharing is integral for raising awareness. These Personalized action frames were articulated into Collective action frames illustrating how the movement connected the fragmented actors into a coherent whole based on the collective identity. Furthermore the BLM-movement illustrated how new Personalized action frames were created, based on the collective identity, providing actors with a way of engaging in continuous dynamic co-creation of the movement based on personal reasons through Personalized action frames.

are used as a way of interpreting doing the challenge and as a way of self-validation by sharing content and inspiring others to engage based on the Nominations which are perceived to function as an act of legitimization. These Personalized action frames are crucial for the movement as doing the challenge or donating money is what constitutes the movement.

### 5.1.2 Shared understandings

The following section takes outset in this framework and identifies the various way in which each of these aspects has influenced the co-creation of shared understandings that constitute the communities.
5.1.2.1 Organization

The self-organizing nature of DNA influences the co-creation of shared understandings by enabling a spontaneously rising chorus of independent voices to interact and engage in co-creation. This was identified in all shared understandings.

Technology is identified as the organizing agent and influential in the co-creation of these shared understandings. All three movements confirm the literature by illustrating the *pancake*-structure (Schneckenberg, 2009) and unrestricted network access (Wasko et al., 2004) where everyone is able to, and due to the self-motivating nature combined with the need for a sense of connection (Fournier & Lee, 2009), engage in co-creation of online communities based on shared issues, values of belief in a narrative (Choi & Scott, 2013; Castells, 2000). The influence of the technological paradigm and mediating technologies is also substantiated by these findings, as actors mobilize in NSMs in order to raise awareness and potentially empower fragmented individuals (Fenton, 2008).

5.1.2.2 Structure

The co-creation of shared understandings is influenced by the large-scale fluid structure of the movement where fragmented actors are brought together by the mediating ability of social media that enables easy and casual (weak-tied) interactions. It was also identified that the co-creation of shared understandings occurred through co-creation with the community rather than single individuals. This is identified in all shared understandings.

Weak-tied interactions defined by new, distant and infrequent interactions (Alava & Tiwana, 2002) were identified in all the communities through their ability to bridge social peripheries (Schneckenberg, 2009; Chiu et al., 2006; Seraj, 2012; Granovetter, 1983; Choi & Scott, 2013). At the same time *personal stories* (#YesAllWomen) and *victimization* (Black Lives Matter) illustrate the construction of stronger ties based on the voluntary investment and emotional communication (Brown et al., 2007; Choi & Scott, 2013) identified in interaction taking place at an interpersonal level.

5.1.2.3 Motivation

The self-motivating *act of sharing* was found to influence the co-creation of shared understandings by initially motivating actors to engage in co-creation. This was identified in all shared understandings and confirms the arguments of Bennett & Segerberg (2012) and Wasko et al. (2004) that argues how voluntary participation defines the communities as well as illustrating the potential strength of weak ties (Granovetter, 1983). This was especially seen in the shared
understanding *doing the challenge* (#IceBucketChallenge) that especially was defined by the *act of sharing* and actors self-validating.

The forging of a common cause is at the same time found to be at the core of the movements influencing the co-creation of shared understandings. This was especially seen in the co-creation of *collaboration* (#YesAllWomen) and *victimization* (BLM) as the engagement with and belief in the shared narrative motivated actors to collaborate and collectively forge a common cause. This reflects the literature arguing that stronger ties increases motivation to interact (Haythornthwaite, 2002; Seraj, 2012). The idea that the joint effort of many leads to a better outcome (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009) can also be identified in the ALS-movement, as even the actors who sought self-validation over the common cause was found to still contribute to the common cause, illustrating how the actors pursuing their self-interest instinctively seems move collectively towards a common cause (Schneckenberg, 2009).

### 5.1.2.4 Identity framing

The construction of a united “we” is identified in BLM and #YesAllWomen and is found to be integral to the co-creation of shared understandings as they are defined by the collective identity. This is especially seen in the *collaboration* (#YesAllWomen) and *victimization* (BLM), as they both rely on actors engaging in co-creation based on shared values or a shared belief in the narrative. This collective identity was also found to influence *raise awareness* (#YesAllWomen) and both *connecting the fragmented* and *raise awareness* (BLM). The construction of a collective identity was in both #YesAllWomen and BLM found to increase homophily as a result of co-creation, confirming the arguments of Brown et al. (2007).

In the ALS-movement the lack of united “we” influenced the co-creation of shared understandings, as the co-creation of sharing understandings is based on self-validation through sharing and endorsing content that act as legitimization by contributing to the common cause (Cristancho & Anduiza, 2013; Lim, 2013; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). This was identified in the co-creation of all three shared understandings.

These findings illustrate how communities are created by actors engaging in co-creation of shared understandings by sharing ideas and information (Luo et al., 2015) and how the collective identity can mediate solidarity between fragmented actors (Fenton, 2008) based solely on a mental construct which exists in the minds of members (Ardichvili et al., 2003; Fournier & Lee, 2009). These findings also confirm the impact of a *joint effort* (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009).
5.1.2.5 Boundary

All three movements required – in theory – actors to make some sort of commitment in order to engage in co-creation. In #YesAllWomen this is seen in the emotions and seriousness of the issue which requires active participating to adopt some self-changing identity, especially seen in the personal stories. In BLM a sort of boundary was identified to influence the shared understanding raising awareness as participation in offline events requires commitment and victimization as engaging in co-creation of the collective identity required a commitment. In the ALS-movement a boundary was identified to influence the co-creation of doing the challenge as actively taking part required social action and commitment, as well as collaborative effort where complying to social norms represented a required commitment. However, in all three cases actors were found to circumvent these requirements, and through the unrestricted access and self-organizing nature of social media interact and engage in co-creation of shared understandings without committing oneself and adopt a more self-changing social identity.

The potential for circumventing requirements and commitment argues for the influence of connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). The lack of commitment by actors also illustrates the impact of the technological revolution as actors would rather engage in rapidly shifting issues than fully pledged ideologies thus avoiding commitments (Fenton, 2008; Chadwick, 2007).

5.1.2.6 Communicative content

In all three social movements the co-creation of shared understandings was defined by the use of personalized action frames. In #YesAllWomen the personal stories clearly reflected the personalized action frames. The personalized action frames are integral to co-creation as seen in how they influenced collaboration and thereby the forging of a common cause, which then influenced the co-creation of Raise awareness as these personalized action frames where articulated into collective action frames.

In BLM the personalized action frames were identified in the shared understandings of raising awareness and connecting the fragmented as they enabled individual actors to engage in the co-creation initially based on the self-motivating act of sharing. Connecting the fragmented is further influenced by these as they as mentioned are articulated into collective action frames, which then inspires the creation of new personalized action frames, again influencing the co-creation of the shared understandings.

The ALS-movement is dominated by the use of personalized action frames due to the lack of a common cause and united “we”. The personalized action frames were especially seen in the
shared understanding of *doing the challenge* which identified all the shared videos of challenges as variant of a personal interpretation of the *challenge*. The use of *personalized action frames* was further identified in *raising awareness* which was co-created by actors contributing engaging in interactions based on self-validation as sharing content with all variants of personal interpretation of the challenge.

The use of *personalized action frames* illustrates the impact of the *logic of connective action* (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), and illustrate how actors in an attempt to make sense of reality compare their own perception of the world with others’ (Brass et al., 2004). They also illustrate the potential for dynamic co-creation (Wasko et al., 2004) and the impact of Web 2.0 (Lewis et al., 2010; Castells, 2000; Yates & Pacuette, 2011). Seeing how these *personalized action frames* in some cases are articulated into *collective action frames*, illustrates the impact of co-creation on shared understandings (Luo et al., 2015) and how the concept of NSMs illustrates how shared beliefs in a narrative can inspire collaboration (Fenton, 2008).

### 5.2 Hybrid model

Based on these findings a hybrid framework identifying the *logics of action* in online social movements is proposed:

*Framework 4: The Hybrid Model (Author’s own)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework 4</th>
<th>Logics of Action in online social movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Self-organizing digitally networked action based on technology as the organizing agents resulting in a leaderless movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Large-scale fluid networks defined by weak-tied interactions and unrestricted network access. Ties are primarily forged with the network as a whole and rarely on the interpersonal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>The self-motivating <em>act of sharing</em> is an act of personal expression and self-validation, which is integral for the initial engagement in co-creation. Over time a common cause is potentially forged collectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity framing</strong></td>
<td>If a united “we” is constructed based on the common cause, a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
collective identity will influence interactions and some level of group polarization might occur due to increased homophily. If there is no construction of a united “we” self-validation is found to be the primary motivational factor, inspired by the common cause.

**Boundary**

Boundaries based on social norms exist but are easily circumvented due to the nature of self-organizing movements, however movements with higher levels of group polarization might require some commitment in the form of social action or change in social identity.

**Communicative content**

*Personalized action frames* are integral to online social movements as they are tightly linked with the self-organizing nature that inspires interactions and enables engagement with and co-creation of online communities.

Over time these *personalized action frames* are in some cases articulated into *collective action frames* based on the collective identity, these *collective action frames* are then either catalysts for higher levels of group polarization or foundations for the creation of new *personalized action frames* ensuring the dynamic co-creation of the movement and corresponding community.
Part 6: Conclusion

The following section answers the proposed research question and concludes the final findings of the thesis. Based on these conclusions, theoretical and practical implications are discussed as well as the limitations of the study.

6.1 Conclusions

This thesis finds that actors mobilize in large-scale fluid networks organized by utilizing technology (e.g. a hashtag) as an organizing agent. These large-scale networks are dominated by weak-tied interactions at the macro-level, however within these online movements stronger social relations are also identified between actors at an interpersonal level.

The self-motivating act of sharing is integral to the movements, as it defines the premise for actors interacting and thus engaging in co-creation of shared understandings. The self-motivating act is further crucial as the self-organizing nature of DNA that was identified in all three studied social movements is dependent on actors interacting. This self-motivating act of sharing was further identified in actors seeking self-validation by interacting, sharing content and recognizing content of others, reflecting how the act of sharing is reciprocated and thereby acts as legitimization by pursuing a common cause.

Based on the self-motivating act of sharing and the self-organizing nature of DNA the thesis found that personalized action frames provide a crucial aspect of the online movements, as these personalized action frames acts as a vehicle for interactions and thereby co-creation of shared understandings, thus constituting the online communities.

A common cause was identified in all three studied movements reflecting how actors interacting and engaging in co-creation over time forge a common cause. In two of these movements this led to the creation of a collective identity, which resulted in the articulation of personalized action frames into collective action frames providing empowerment for the isolated actors interacting and participating in the movement. Furthermore in one of the movements new personalized action frames, where constructed based on the collective identity inspiring continuous dynamic co-creation of the movement and thereby the community.

6.2 Theoretical implications

This thesis has shown that the technological revolution has changed the world and influenced the way actors live and interact across time and space. Mediating technologies are identified as potential actors in the network where technology acts as an organizing agent enabling large-scale
networks of weak-tied actors based on the ability for social media to easily and casually mediate interactions. However as the analysis shows these large-scale networks are morphing through continuous co-creation and so are the shared understandings that constitute them. Further research is therefore needed on communities and their dynamic nature.

The study also finds that even though actors pursue their self-interests they still seem to move collectively which support the findings of Schneckenberg (2009). However further research is needed to investigate if these seemingly collective movements are defined by actors actively engaging in active co-creation and collective forging of common cause and united “we”, or if these movements merely seem to move collectively, as actors only take part in these easy-come-easy-go politics, focusing on rapidly shifting issues rather than adopt self-changing social identities and make a commitment to engage in the co-creation of collective identities.

6.3 Practical implications
The three studied movements illustrate three different potential types of impact of online social movements. The logic of connective action has received criticism for being chaotic and lacking the commitment found in traditional collective action, however the ALS-movement, which arguably represents most characteristics of the logic of connective action succeeded in raising awareness and money through self-organizing networks of actors contributing to a common cause based on the self-motivating act of sharing. In comparison the #YesAllWomen-movement, which represents more characteristics of collective action by co-creating a collective identity and articulating personal action frames into collective action frames, showed less direct impact. Finally the BLM-movement illustrated a dynamic community that is continuously co-created, as the continuous articulation of personalized action frames into collective action frames, and the creation of new memes based on the collective action frames has kept the BLM-movement relevant seeing that even though it gained nationwide awareness in the end of 2014 it is still discussed, and a theme in the USA 2016 presidential campaign.

One difference that is identified in this study is the purpose of the movements. The ALS-movement had a clear purpose of raising money and awareness that through a fun approach inspired a large crowd to interact and through joint effort became a success. The BLM-movement represents a strong visual narrative “stop killing us” that enables the memes to leave traces and inspire dynamic co-creation even though the movement over the years has fluctuated in activity. These two movements illustrate the potential of a clear purpose in comparison to the #YesAllWomen, which is focused on more the general issue of perceived male entitlement in our society. Further
research is therefore needed to what extent these movements have an impact and achieve social change or when a lack of focus result in chaotic and unproductive movements, in order to identify what differentiates the online social movements that achieve social change.

6.4 Limitations

In order to keep the thesis as focused and narrow as possible in order to conduct an interesting in-depth analysis some limitations had to be made. The literature review has throughout argued for the use of certain theories or elements, there is however themes that are omitted. One of these is the discussion of motivational factors for actors to engage with networks. It is assumed that participation in these digital networks is self-motivating either based on a common cause or as a part of self-validation, however there is a wide array of intrinsic and extrinsic potentially relevant values that influences the motivation of actors to interact.

The research was conducted based on data manually collected from Twitter. This process voided the data of some complexity and thereby the opportunity for further potentially interesting findings such as conducting a network analysis in order to identify key nodes in the network based on re-tweeted and liked tweets.

The netnographic study also has the limitation that results are difficult to generalize as findings are based on actions and interactions in a specific context. The studied movements are therefore potentially also influenced by interactions taking place at other platforms, but due to limited resources this was not studied.
References

- Freelon, D., Mcilwain, C. D. & Clark, M. D. (2016). *Beyond the hashtags #Ferguson, #BlackLivesMatter, and the online struggle for offline justice*. Center for Media & Social Impact. School of Communication American University


• Seraj, M. (2012). *We Create, We Connect, We Respect, Therefore We Are: Intellectual, Social, and Cultural Value in Online Communities*. Journal of Interactive Marketing 26, pp. 209-222. Elsevier Inc.


**Frontpage illustrations**


• Black Lives Matter illustration: https://pbs.twimg.com/media/B3317RrCMAA3qIC.jpg visited 15-04-16

• ALS Ice Bucket Challenge illustration: http://www.alsa.org/fight-als/assets/ibc-howto595px.png visited 15-04-16

• #YesAllWomen illustration: http://wayvs.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/yes-all-women-704x400.jpg visited 15-04-16
Appendix 1: Example of dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Tweet</th>
<th>Retweets</th>
<th>Likes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Schulten/Verificet</td>
<td>Update: the man who died in that Nantucket diving accident had just hours before raised $100,000 for ALS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>© Ryan Schulten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Ryan Sanders/Verificet</td>
<td>I'm just gonna send a check and call it a day... AALS #IceBucketChallenge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>© Kendall Ryan Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kim cecconi @lumber_yak</td>
<td>A votre avis quelle personnalité francaise va lancer le #IceBucketChallenge ?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@leslierouch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrey Mattson @torreymattson</td>
<td>Here's my #IceBucketChallenge @zamaparty @ChrisTHillman @JonRyan9 @tecdlugart @Guy guys you have 24hr to Medhat착춘현 @yunus becpsi 24h 25/4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@torreymattson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Smith @CorySmith20</td>
<td>Passing the ice bucket ALS challenge to you Nick! @hobenbakes @bakeyourchallengePassing the ice bucket ALS challenge to you Nick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@CorySmith20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Reds Verificet kento @Reds</td>
<td>@JimDayTV takes the #IceBucketChallenge and challenges @cuban2727 @StinkerOutALS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@Reds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha @ms_shorty1363</td>
<td>#Icebucketchallenge nominate bryceelman06 @td_emman06 tyson16_lineagold1 @aafarbybux3 love u !!! U...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@ms_shorty1363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mathilde @lamlksja</td>
<td>The #Icebucketchallenge is the best thing ever seriously !!!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@lamlksja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Chilcott @caseycmusic</td>
<td>Well this was fun... and my poor puppy got wet lol #StinkerOutALS #IceBucketChallenge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@caseycmusic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes?? @TrystenWoods</td>
<td>nahah my three year old cousin did the #Icebucketchallenge. He's too cute!</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@TrystenWoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Doctors Verificet kento @TheDoctors</td>
<td>@TheDoctors accept the #Icebucketchallenge! <a href="http://youtu.be/kCvz1ZmEeVo">http://youtu.be/kCvz1ZmEeVo</a>. Visit <a href="http://www.alsa.org">http://www.alsa.org</a> to help find a cure! @alsassociation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@TheDoctors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy / くいよ @quitveony</td>
<td>MY PRAYERS WERE ANSWERED!!! @mwhiddleston got challenged to do the ALS #IceBucketChallenge thank you @NathanPillon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@quitveony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Trucco/Verificet</td>
<td>Hey @nathanPillon here's my #Icebucketchallenge. I call out @larryourown and @realsamthorpe</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@MichaelTrucco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeamPennStateNHL @NMPennState</td>
<td>Mrs. Getz does the ice bucket challenge! #IceBucketChallenge @ALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@NMPennState</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Joseph @mreau13</td>
<td>ALS ICE BUCKET CHALLENGE by barossister accepting my nomination. @als #Icebucketchallenge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@mreau13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Gonzalez @SaraGonzalesTX</td>
<td>Do BOTH, people! RT @GPoklowski #Fact: if you take the #IceBucketChallenge instead of sending in money, you're not doing it*** to cure ALS. *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@SaraGonzalesTX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lak Bajaj @L_Balin69</td>
<td>I'm probably going to do this bucket challenge tomorrow so watch out you just might get nominated @WhoWillBeIceBucketChallenge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@L_Balin69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvitLife @EnviLife</td>
<td>#IceBucketChallenge completed. Now, i challenge you... all of you to complete this to show support for...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@EnviLife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie_ @charmed_comm</td>
<td>I just SO happy to see @B_Combs and @DohertyShannon did the #IceBucketChallenge. I just love these girls. #OneDayAtATimeForever</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kötü</td>
<td>@charmed_comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James @sanders_69</td>
<td>Just thought I'd share this with you all. I hate my sister lol #IceBucketChallenge <a href="https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=611891742262962&amp;fref=ts">https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=611891742262962&amp;fref=ts</a> &amp;ref=100003234531044</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Coding manual

The coding manual provides the coder with the needed information in order to ensure reliability in the data coding. The following appendix will therefore explain the thoughts behind the chosen categories and explain certain choices made during the coding process.

The tweets are coded into main categories identified by reading through the available data and classifying main themes and categories. This process identified the following six main categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness</td>
<td>Tweets in this category seeks to raise awareness about a perceived issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal stories</td>
<td>Tweets in this category employ a personalized action frame to interpret, translate and communicate content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup notions</td>
<td>Tweets in this category represent a certain level of homophily and group polarization by confirming a collective identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Tweets in this category seeks collaboration between actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Tweets in this category disagree with the purpose of the movement and its message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Tweets in this category are irrelevant for the analysis as they either illustrate unrelated use of the hashtag, out-of-context comments or non-english tweets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two small deviations occurred: No tweets were found to represent the *ingroup notion* in the #IceBucketChallenge tweets and another category was identified in the #BlackLivesMatter tweets as the *ingroup notions* was split into *victimization* that identified the tweets describing experiences of being a victim in society and *anti authorities* that displayed police brutality and more progressively was criticizing authorities. In the #BlackLivesMatter tweets the category *personal stories* was also changed into *offline activism*. 
Besides these six categories the tweets were also coded into *affective* categories describing the emotions identified in the tweet. The six *affective* categories are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>Tweets in this category represent a defensive or protective point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Tweets in this category represent negative emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Tweets in this category are found to be neutral and not providing any emotional cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>Tweets in the category will either aggressively seek something or present a direct call to action either towards individual actors or a collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Tweets in this category represent positive emotions and attitude in the content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Tweets in this category seeks to endorse or support others, either individual actors or a collective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attached images and videos were accounted for during the coding by comparing the tweets in the dataset to the tweets from the Twitter stream.
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