

HILLARY CLINTON'S POLITICAL CAMPAIGN COMMUNICATION IN THE
INTERACTIVE FACEBOOK WORLD

A Thesis
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
MEGAN SCHUMACHER
Associate Professor Jon Stemmler, Thesis Supervisor

DECEMBER 2017

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

HILLARY CLINTON'S POLITICAL CAMPAIGN COMMUNICATION IN THE
INTERACTIVE FACEBOOK WORLD

presented by Megan Schumacher,

a candidate for the degree of master of arts,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Jon Stemmler

Professor Shelly Rodgers

Professor Debra Mason

Professor Ben Warner

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank several people for their help with the completion of this thesis. Thanks to Professor Jon Stemmler for serving as the chair of my thesis committee. He provided invaluable guidance, advice and expertise throughout the entire process, from proposal creation to defense. Dr. Shelly Rodgers provided needed and much-appreciated assistance with data analysis and statistical methods, for which I cannot thank her enough. I would also like to thank Dr. Debra Mason and Dr. Ben Warner for serving as members of my committee. Their thoughtful insights and input were essential to the successful completion of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
List of Tables	v
Abstract	vi
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
2. Literature Review	5
Agenda Setting	5
Receive-Accept-Sample Model	8
Social Media and Elections	11
Facebook and Social Buttons	14
Engagement Tactics	15
3. Methodology	18
Content Analysis	18
Sampling Frame	19
Unit of Analysis	20
Coding Procedure & Scheme	21
Intracoder Reliability	21
Data Analysis	22
4. Results	23
5. Discussion	43

Limitations and Opportunities for Future Research	46
6. Conclusion	50
7. References	51
Appendix	
A. Coding Instructions	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequency of Different Types of Benoit's Functional Approach	24
2. Frequency of Different Types of Aristotelian Rhetoric	24
3. Frequency of Different Types of Rhetorical Devices	25
4. Frequency of Different Types of Calls to Action	26
5. Frequency of Different Types of Policy Themes	26
6. Frequency of Different Types of Post Structures	27
7. Frequency of Different Types of Photo Content	28
8. Frequency of Different Types of Video Content	29
9. Mean Interaction with Different Types of Benoit's Functional Approach	32
10. Mean Interaction with Different Types of Aristotelian Rhetoric	33
11. Mean Interaction with Different Types of Rhetorical Devices	34
12. Mean Interaction with Different Types of Calls to Action	36
13. Mean Interaction with Different Types of Policy Themes	37
14. Mean Interaction with Different Types of Post Structures	39
15. Mean Interaction with Different Types of Photo Content	40
16. Mean Interaction with Different Types of Video Content	42

HILLARY CLINTON'S POLITICAL CAMPAIGN COMMUNICATION IN THE INTERACTIVE FACEBOOK WORLD

Megan Schumacher

Professor Jon Stemmler, Thesis Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This research uses content analysis to examine the role of social media in modern American political communication. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between different message strategies and level of engagement by focusing on Hillary Clinton's Facebook posts between October 1, 2016, and November 7, 2016, just prior to the campaign election. Agenda-setting theory will be examined in relation to political campaigns' increasing ability to engage voters directly via social media. The number of interactions via Facebook's native buttons will provide a way to measure interactions. It's important to know what message strategies are most effective on Facebook because the more interactions a post receives, the more widely that message has the potential to be distributed via newsfeeds. According to the receive-accept-sample model of information processing, exposure to a message can affect people's opinions and behaviors, so future political campaigns could benefit from the current research by using its findings when determining message strategies.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this content analysis study is to examine the effect of different message strategies on the level of engagement on posts to Hillary Clinton's Facebook page between October 1, 2016, and November 7, 2016, just prior to the campaign election. The independent variables are different message strategies, including varying content, structure and rhetorical tools, used by the Clinton campaign. The dependent variable, level of engagement, is defined as the number of interactions received via the native Facebook buttons of emoji reactions, comments and shares. The theory of agenda-setting will be examined in relation to social media and political campaigns, and the receive-accept-sample model of information processing will highlight the importance of audience engagement.

Rationale

As media have evolved, so have presidential election campaigns. From newspapers to radio to television to the digital age, candidates have had to adapt to the changing media landscape. Social media is the latest innovation to have an effect on candidates' communication strategy. Barack Obama's 2008 presidential election campaign was unprecedented in its use of social media. Previous presidential candidates had used the internet to collect donations, but Obama was the first to harness the new opportunities provided by social media and use them to communicate directly with voters (Miller, 2008).

Obama wasn't the first presidential candidate to break new ground in incorporating emerging media into campaign communication. Much like 2008's race has been referred to as "the Facebook election," the presidential election of 1924 is known as "the radio election." Radio allowed presidential candidates to show and use their personalities, which helped Calvin Coolidge win votes and claim the presidency in 1924 (Gould, 2003). Radio became even more popular in the years that followed and was most famously used by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his fireside chats, which he used to create a bond between himself and the public (Impact and Legacy, n.d.). The world of presidential campaigns changed again in 1952. By that time, 18 million televisions had been sold, and there were 112 telecasting stations in 66 markets. That year, both Dwight D. Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson used television to disseminate their messaging. The Republican National Committee even issued a guide titled *ABC of Getting the Most Out of TV*. In it, RNC's Chairman Guy Gabrielson wrote, "Television's impact... will be so great that it must command our earnest attention as a political force" (Shaffer, 1955).

The rise of the internet and social media has forced campaign planners to rethink how they fundraise and gain support for political candidates. By Election Day in 2008, Obama had millions of followers across multiple social media platforms. His campaign's ability to organize and mobilize voters was unprecedented. Previous candidates, including Howard Dean in 2004, had tapped into the internet's ability to help them collect many donations of small sums of money (Miller, 2008). But Obama understood that the web could be used to build a brand and engage with voters for a relatively low cost, while simultaneously giving voters the ability to organize get-out-the-vote efforts on his behalf (Carr, 2008). Carpenter (2010) describes Andrew Chadwick's framework of

political engagement in the U.S. and how it is affected by the internet, including its ability to aide in discourse among citizens, enable citizens to disseminate informational content and knowledge, make data collection and aggregation easier and more important, and encourage experimentation and collaboration. Barack Obama's 2008 presidential campaign was able to analyze the audiences it collected on various social media platforms and use that data to tailor messages to potential voters (Carpenter, 2010).

As social media continue to evolve, candidates will be forced to critically evaluate their strategy and continuously adapt to changes in the social media landscape. This thesis will take a quantitative approach in exploring via content analysis the use and effectiveness of social media in modern political campaigns by focusing on Hillary Clinton's use of Facebook in the 38 days preceding the 2016 presidential election and the amount of interaction that was prompted by different types of content and strategies. Similar research was done by Gerodimos and Justinussen (2015) for Obama's 2012 Facebook campaign and can be used to show similarities and differences to the previous election cycle. Agenda-setting theory will be examined in relation to political campaigns' increasing ability to reach voters directly via social media.

The purpose of this research is to determine which message strategies used by the Clinton campaign in 2016 were the most successful in increasing engagement and number of interactions (as measured by number of emoji reactions, comments and shares) on Facebook. Through the lens of the receive-accept-sample model of information processing, the number of interactions a post garners is important because every time a post receives an emoji reaction, comment or share, it has the potential to be disseminated into more people's newsfeeds, which allows that message to reach more and more people.

For that reason, it's crucial for campaigns to know how to harness social media's full potential.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Agenda Setting

Wimmer and Dominick define agenda setting as “the theory that the media provide topics of discussion and importance for consumers” (2011). The agenda-setting role of the media during elections has been studied for decades. One study, done through the lens of the 1992 presidential campaign, compared newspaper coverage with citizens’ interests. Researchers found that newspapers’ control of the agenda-setting process is shared with elites and the public, who help define the most important campaign issues. In the media-centered model of the agenda-setting theory, media coverage causes public interest. On the other hand, in the transaction-process model of the agenda-setting theory, candidates, the media and citizens themselves contribute to what the media covers and the public is interested in. The research indicated that the transaction-process model was a more accurate depiction of reality, and newspapers’ agenda-setting role during elections has been overstated (Dalton, Beck, & Huckfeldt, 1998). This information shows that newspapers aren’t the only entity that has a hand in agenda-setting, which supports campaigns’ use of social media because it is possible that they are helping to set the agenda for what the public will read about and care about. It also suggests that the public is open to receiving information from places other than mainstream, traditional media.

During the 2008 presidential election campaign, a group of researchers used six mainstream news websites in the United States (cnn.com, foxnews.com, abcnews.com, cbsnews.com, usatoday.com and washingtonpost.com) to find out whether there was a gap between what journalists displayed prominently and what consumers read. The study

looked specifically at the time during the 2008 campaign to see if it differed from a time of routine political activity. Researchers found that during routine times, journalists featured public affairs news prominently, but consumers preferred non-public-affairs news, such as sports, entertainment and crime stories. The thematic gap changed, however, by site during campaign coverage, and both journalists and consumers favored public affairs news as Election Day neared. Overall, though, journalists' thematic choices and occupational values were not as fluid as consumers' choices and taste. These findings suggested that the media's agenda-setting function was stronger during times with more political activity, such as election season (Boczkowski, 2012). This increased agenda-setting function during election season suggests citizens' desire to consume political communication is higher as Election Day nears. This gives campaigns a chance to distribute their messages, originally posted on social media, to interested audiences through traditional media because traditional media frequently report on messages candidates have shared through social media. This was shown most clearly in the 2016 presidential election as news organizations frequently reported on Republican candidate Donald Trump's tweets. This gives campaigns a unique chance to set the agenda they want.

In another study examining traditional media's role in agenda-setting, researchers were interested in the ability to predict Google search trends based on newspaper and television coverage during the 2008 election. To do this, they focused on the persistent rumor that Obama was Muslim and found that information-seeking behavior could be predicted by mainstream news exposure. This supports mainstream media's agenda-setting effect. Research indicated that coverage by mainstream media made the rumor

more publicly salient. This effect was much stronger for television coverage than newspaper coverage (Weeks, 2010). This finding shows the media's ability to reach people and tell them what to think about. However, the fact that people need to search for more information after reading or viewing something is a bad sign for people's trust in mainstream media, as well as the media's ability to thoroughly explain an issue. This presents another opportunity for campaigns to reach people with their messaging because when people seek out more information, many of those searches will lead to the candidates' social media pages where candidates can control and present their own agenda.

The agenda-setting theory research discussed in this section supports the idea that the rise of social media have presented a new opportunity for campaigns to distribute their messaging directly to voters, which has given campaigns some control over setting the agenda during campaigns. Dalton, Beck, and Huckfeldt (1998) presented research that suggests traditional media share the agenda-setting role. Campaigns' ability to share their messages unfiltered through social media gives them a way to play a role in agenda setting. Boczkowski (2012) presented research that suggests traditional media's agenda-setting power increases during presidential campaigns. Because traditional media frequently report on social media activity by candidates, this gives campaigns the ability to help set the agenda by presenting their messaging through social media. Weeks (2010) presented research that suggests people are left with questions after consuming information from traditional media, which causes them to seek out more information on the Internet. That search for more information can lead people to candidates' messaging on their social media platforms, where candidates can present information that supports

and, thus, furthers their agenda. As social media continue to rise in popularity, it can be assumed that campaigns' agenda-setting power will increase with it.

Receive-Accept-Sample Model

The receive-accept-sample model was first presented in 1992 by John Zaller in his book *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. In the book, Zaller develops the model to explain how people consume political information from the mass media and how that information is converted it into political preferences that affect voting behavior. The RAS model describes how people form opinions and how the opinions are affected by messages they have been exposed to and their political awareness and prior beliefs (Zaller, 1992).

Vaccari (2013) conducted interviews with 31 political consultants and operatives involved in the 2008 presidential campaign to study whether “developments in the social shaping of technology might have expanded the Web’s persuasive power in politics.” Previous research had pointed to the idea that people’s beliefs can only be reinforced, not changed, online because people select what they view online. However, the increasing social nature of the Internet, including social media sites, could change that finding. Vaccari (2013) explored this issue through the lens of the RAS model. Under the RAS model of attitude change, Vaccari (2013) explained, change-producing messages must be received and accepted for attitude change to occur. People resist messages that disagree with their attitudes in three ways. Partisan resistance is when they reject messages because they are inconsistent with their previously held attitudes. Inertial resistance is when preexisting considerations outweigh the new information. Countervalent resistance

is when they can provide counter-arguments to new information they encounter. Political awareness is a big factor in whether people will accept messages. The most politically aware people, meaning they pay attention to and understand politics, are likely to receive messages. However, they are least likely to accept messages based on one of the three resistance mechanisms. The opposite is true for the least politically aware individuals. They are less likely to receive messages, but more likely to accept messages due to weak resistance mechanisms. This means that moderately aware individuals are the most persuadable because they are more likely to both receive and accept messages. Another variable in the RAS model, according to Vaccari (2013), is message intensity, or how many people the message reaches. High intensity makes the least aware people the most persuadable. Moderate intensity makes the moderately aware most persuadable. Low intensity makes the highly aware most persuadable. Using the RAS theory, this means that the more interaction a post receives, the more intensity it gains, which makes it more able to persuade even the moderately aware voters (Vaccari, 2013).

Facebook and other social networking sites have a unique ability to get a political message to a wide population of people who don't necessarily agree with the message because it isn't an inherently political platform. People are more likely to seek out political messaging that matches their beliefs in more political spaces online. However, Facebook and other non-political social networking sites increase exposure to and deliberation of politically dissonant content (Wojcieszak & Mutz, 2009), which increases the intensity of political messages. Web 2.0 tools, including social buttons on Facebook, allow supporters of campaigns to engage in low-threshold activities, such as reacting to, sharing or commenting on posts, which, in turn, helps increase the intensity of that

message by easily distributing it to their contacts on Facebook. This increases inadvertent exposure to the message by people who otherwise wouldn't have seen it, and this increases the reception of the message (Vaccari, 2013).

According to Vaccari (2013), "Although campaigns cannot control how their content will be re-distributed by the online public, which includes the possibility that it will be criticized or distorted, most professionals are convinced that the benefits outweigh the cost and that, more broadly, decentralized message diffusion is inevitable." The more people are exposed to a message, the more chance there is for indirect persuasion through interpersonal communication. When people hear a message from someone they know, it increases acceptance because of the high credibility of social ties (Vaccari, 2013).

In a study of college undergraduates, Bode (2012) found that a high level of engagement with one's Facebook community can spur political participation. The study also showed that political participation wasn't predicted by a feeling a closeness to one's Facebook community (Bode, 2012). This finding that Facebook use can have a positive effect on political participation and the fact that this positive effect is not dependent on whether a person feels an intimacy with those in their network is a good sign that a political message that is widely shared and, thus, viewed can spur actions online, such as sharing a post, and offline, such as voting.

Himmelboim, Lariscy, Tinkham, and Sweetser (2012) found that some people were willing to listen to and learn from political messages shared by others with whom they share both strong and weak bonds. This is a good predictor that a message spread widely on Facebook will affect many people because if even an acquaintance is seen liking or sharing a post, that can influence someone's reaction to and reception of that post.

The research discussed in this section, consistent with the receive-accept-sample theory, shows that when someone sees information that was shared via low-threshold activities, such as content shared by friends on Facebook, it can improve the reception of campaigns' messaging. Because of this, it's important for campaigns to know which message strategies are likely to elicit more interactions via emoji reactions, comments and shares on Facebook. Each interaction causes the message to appear in more newsfeeds, which increases the message's intensity and chances for acceptance.

Social Media and Elections

Social media caused changes in the campaign landscape in 2008. Spaeth (2009) described how, during that election cycle, all forms of communication, including public relations and advertising began merging. After candidates gave speeches, those speeches were posted online for supporters to share, for example. Email newsletters were tailored to each receiver's interests. Social media's influence was felt in all aspects of campaigning. Humor became a more important part of a candidate's profile, and clips of candidates poking fun at themselves garnered millions of views on the internet. For example, in 2008, Hillary Clinton did humorous "Hillcast" videos that spoofed her campaign. Candidates' ability to use humor made them more approachable (Spaeth, 2009). It can be assumed that social media made this use of humor more possible not only because candidates could play off popular internet humor naturally, but also because social media made the monetary stakes lower. Unlike expensive television ads, a well-timed, humorous Facebook post could draw hundreds of thousands of interactions without adding to the budget.

Takaragawa and Carty (2012) studied how social media influenced the professional and democratic models of political organization and mobilization during the 2008 presidential election campaign. Although mobilization is still structured traditionally in a top-down way, Obama's messages of hope and change were especially targeted at social media because it appealed to millennials who lived on Facebook and was a good way to mobilize that group. The horizontal sharing done on social media is credited with the large young-voter turnout in 2008. The Obama campaign used social media to reach young people and rework the relationship between the candidate and the voters he was trying to reach. This seemed to work, as Obama's online supporters were more likely to volunteer and contribute money than their offline counterparts. Horizontal communication helps campaigns because when people receive information that a friend has shared with them, they're more likely to consider it than if, for example, they're watching the same information in a campaign television commercial (Takaragawa & Carty, 2012). The idea that messaging shared on social media can be more effective than paid advertisements is an important development for campaigns, and makes it likely that this type of message distribution will continue to increase.

Social media's effect on political behavior among undergraduate students during the 2008 presidential campaign is an area of interest for many researchers, including Vitak et al. (2011). They focused on Facebook usage during that election because of its popularity among 18-24-year-olds and wanted to find out if campaigns' use of Facebook affected young people's rate of political participation or if it just facilitated slacktivism, web-based political participation with no impact in the real world. The study found that real-life and Facebook political participation was based on the amount of time and effort

it took to complete an activity. The more time and effort it took, the less common it was for a student to have completed it. The study also found that the more students agreed with the appropriateness of political communication on Facebook, the more likely they were to engage in political activity on Facebook and that the more politically active a student was on Facebook, the more likely they were to participate politically offline (Vitak et al., 2011). This information shows that students specifically are engaging politically on Facebook. Whereas only 16 percent of college-age people read newspapers daily (Pew Research Center, 2016), 88 percent of people ages 18-29 use Facebook and, of those, 76 percent use it daily (Pew Research Center, 2017). That is a good reason for campaigns to use social media to reach more young people, and, hopefully, help translate students' online participation to offline participation. This social media-based messaging benefits campaigns because it allows them to reach people they otherwise might not.

Consumers frequently use social media to create content and engage with others, and Hajli (2014) found that when consumers' trust increased, so did their intention to buy. When people created content, they influenced other people in their social network, which benefitted them and the business they were creating content for. Social media has had an empowering effect on consumers, and collaboration and social interaction via social media adds value and encourages building of trust, and thus, intention to buy (Hajli, 2014). There are many benefits of increased trust built through interaction on social networking sites. Although this study focused on consumers, its findings could be expanded logically to voters, and intention to buy could be translated to intention to vote. When people see their friends posting about or sharing posts from a candidate, they are more likely to build trust in that candidate because of this social interaction. Candidates'

use of social media to build a base of supporters helps them build trust with those supporters and creates the opportunity for those supporters to then gain the trust of others in their social networks.

The research discussed in this section shows how the rise of social media have influenced how election campaigns are run and expanded candidates' ability to effectively reach voters without going through traditional media. Social media allows candidates the opportunity to interact with voters on a more personal level, reach voters who are active online and share more of their personality, all of which help create personal bonds with voters. The interactive nature of social media also facilitates social sharing among people who are connected through social media. This social sharing is key to increased message distribution and reception.

Facebook and Social Buttons

According to Pew Research Center, almost 70 percent of Americans use social media. That number has skyrocketed since Pew began to track its use in 2005, when only 5 percent of Americans were active on social media. Facebook is the most popular social networking site; 68 percent of U.S. adults are users of the site, and 91 percent of those people use the site either daily or weekly (Pew Research Center, 2017).

Gerlitz and Helmond (2013) described the rise of social buttons on social media. Social buttons got their start on the websites Reddit and Digg in the Fall 2006. They allowed the users of those websites to share content from around the web to the aggregation sites. Facebook's first social button was the share icon, which first appeared in October 2006 and allowed users to share content from other websites with their network. Facebook introduced the like button in 2009 as a social activity that offers an

easier way to show interest or agreement with friends' posts, including status updates, photos, links and comments. The like button also included a counter to show how many times the item had been liked, including the names of friends who had liked it (Gerlitz & Helmond, 2013).

Prager (2014) explained interactions are important on Facebook because of its algorithm, EdgeRank. Emoji reactions, comments and shares all increase the chance of posts showing up in followers' newsfeeds (Prager, 2014). This information shows just how crucial it is for candidates to be aware of what message strategies increase interactions. Those interactions hold the key to reaching more voters. As discussed previously, the more voters candidates reach, the more possibility there is recruit voters and solidify support among their base.

Engagement Tactics

Research has found that brands' Facebook posts that feature photos, calls to action, questions and emoticons receive increased interactions, and posts that feature videos and links receive decreased interactions (Wasserman, 2012). Brader (2005) found there was a gap in research regarding the effect of emotional appeals in political advertising. His research into campaign advertising and voting behavior found that "political ads can change the way citizens get involved and make choices simply by using images and music to evoke emotions." He focused on two emotions: enthusiasm and fear. He found that ads that cue for enthusiasm increase interest in the campaign and willingness to vote and reliance on "preexisting preferences." Ads that cue for fear increase information-seeking behaviors and "cause changes in political choice." These

findings can be logically expanded to candidates' posts on social media because they serve the same purpose as traditional advertisements. This information on emotions and their effect of voters' political involvement and decision-making can guide campaigns' use of social media and the types of content they post to best serve their desired outcome.

Triadafilopoulos (1999) discusses Aristotle's views on the content of persuasive public speech and the role it plays in political decisions. He states that "Aristotle recognizes that persuasive political speech is reasonable, passionate, and reflective of the character of the speaker." The three elements that affect the persuasive quality of speech are ethos, which relates to the speaker's character; pathos, which relates to the audience's emotions; and logos, which relates to the rationality of the argument to prove the statement's truth (Triadafilopoulos, 1999). The final three months of Barack Obama's and Mitt Romney's Facebook posts during the 2012 election were analyzed for their use of Aristotelian language of persuasion (ethos, pathos and logos), subjects addressed and other uses besides dissemination of information. Bronstein (2013) found that pathos was the most widely used element of Aristotelian language of persuasion, and the number of likes and comments that a post received was influenced by the element of persuasion used in the post. Research also showed that Obama and Romney both used Facebook to "collect social and economic capital" by soliciting donations, seeking volunteers and using their followers to more widely distribute their messages by requesting that they share posts with their friends (Bronstein, 2013). These findings on what message types increased interactions on Facebook are important to campaigns that wish to expand their reach because each interaction helps that message spread farther.

Gerodimos and Justinussen (2015) examined not only Aristotelian language of persuasion, but also dozens of other variables that affect people's interaction level with Facebook posts. They studied the role that social media played in Barack Obama's 2012 campaign, with a focus on the role of Facebook's social buttons (like, comment and share) as tools of political voice. A content analysis was performed on Obama's Facebook posts during the two months prior to the election, and people's responses via social buttons to different message strategies were examined as measures of civic engagement. The research found that people were selective with the messages they interacted with. Posts that used Aristotelian rhetoric and emotional appeals received more interaction than posts that did not. This study will guide the methodology of this thesis, and the researcher will update Gerodimos' and Justinussen's findings for Hillary Clinton's 2016 presidential campaign.

Research Questions

RQ1: What types of message strategies were used by the Clinton campaign on Facebook?

RQ2: Which of the message strategies elicited the most interactions via emoji reactions, comments and shares?

Chapter 3: Methodology

Content Analysis

Content analysis is the method that will be used to explore the research questions in this study. Content analysis is a popular method used in media research. It's an "efficient way to investigate the content of the media" and is described as systematic, objective and quantitative (Wimmer & Dominick, 2011). Content analysis has been used previously, as well, to examine Facebook content used in various fields, including healthcare communications (Park, Rodgers, & Stemmler, 2011).

The content analysis will examine Facebook posts on Hillary Clinton's Facebook page over the course of 38 days. RQ1 will be addressed through a frequency count of the identified variables, which will shed light on the message strategy, including what types of messaging content, structure and tools were used. Through the collection of the number of interactions and the analysis of that data, RQ2 will be addressed and the results will determine which messaging types elicited the most interactions. This study will seek to discover what aspects of Hillary Clinton's Facebook posts helped her increase user engagement.

Through a content analysis, people's engagement with different types of messages will be measured by the amount of interaction with the social buttons available on Facebook. Facebook users can choose to interact with select posts via the native features of emoji reactions, comments and shares. It is assumed that if a post is not interesting enough, then users won't engage with it. Under the receive-accept-sample theory, it is believed that people's attitudes and behaviors can be affected by other people's low-

threshold activities, such as interacting with a politician's Facebook post. By critically examining the message content, structure and tools that were used by the Clinton campaign on Facebook and noting which of the messaging types elicited the most interactions via emoji reactions, comments and shares, we will be able to determine the most effective methods for future campaigns to increase their interactions on Facebook. This research aims to produce generalizable conclusions from the data that can be used by future campaigns, and the content analysis will give valuable insight on what works to increase interactions on Facebook posts and, conversely, what makes people less likely to interact with Facebook posts.

Sampling Frame

This study used the Facebook posts on Hillary Clinton's Facebook page from October 1, 2016, to November 7, 2016, which corresponds to the final 38 days of the 2016 presidential campaign, excluding Election Day. The sample consists of a total of 200 Facebook posts for analysis. The researcher chose to look at only 38 days because of the high volume of Facebook posts made by the Clinton campaign. This 38-day period kept the sample manageable. The final 38 days of the campaign were chosen because it is a crucial time during the campaign for two reasons. First, people pay more attention the election as it nears. When Gallup asked people between November 1, 2012, and November 4, 2012, how much thought they had given to the upcoming presidential election, 78 percent of respondents said "Quite a lot." That was up from 73 percent in September 2012, 67 percent in August 2012, 64 percent in July 2012 and 61 percent in June 2012 (2012). Second, many people decide who will get their vote in the final weeks.

An NBC News exit poll found that in the 2012 election, 9 percent of voters made their decision either “just today” or “in the last few days.” I collected the posts from the official campaign Facebook page by copying them into a Microsoft Word document to ensure a static sample. The collected items include text, photos and number interactions (emoji reactions, comments and shares). The content of the interactions was not collected and all interactions were counted equally, even interactions that are disagreeing or expressing dislike of the post or its topic, because all interactions with a post cause that post to be distributed more widely into people’s newsfeeds whether the person who interacted with the post did so in a negative or positive way. For that reason, this interaction level and its corresponding wider distribution is what we are concerned with for this research, not the emotion behind the interaction.

Unit of Analysis

In a content analysis, a unit of analysis is the smallest item counted by the researcher (Wimmer & Dominick, 2011). For this study, a unit of analysis is a Facebook post, specifically the 200 posts that were published from October 1, 2016, to November 7, 2016. In addition to Facebook posts, other units of analysis used in this study are the number of emoji reactions, comments and shares on the individual Facebook posts. To determine these units of analysis, the researcher collected quantitative data displayed on each post that show the number of emoji reactions, comments and shares the specific post received. The number of emoji reactions, comments and shares could increase or decrease as people continue to interact with the Facebook posts, so that quantitative data

was collected by the researcher during the same specified period of time to ensure those units of analysis are consistent across the individual posts.

Coding Procedure and Scheme

The researcher conducted a content analysis, and the units of analysis were individual Facebook posts. Coding categories are based on a previous study involving Barack Obama's 2012 campaign on Facebook by Gerodimos and Justinussen (2015). Each category represents the property of exhaustivity because each post fits within the codebook's categories. No more than 10 percent of the posts can fall into the "other" category because that would indicate that some relevant content characteristic is being overlooked (Wimmer & Dominick, 2011). Each Facebook post was coded for basic information and the variables found in Gerodimos' and Justinussen's 2015 study, including the use of rhetorical devices (such as questions, quotes, humor, celebrity endorsements), calls to actions, photos, videos and links. Coding was conducted in Qualtrics.

Intracoder Reliability

Wimmer and Dominick explain that reliability is important when it comes to content analysis. "If a content analysis is to be objective, its measures and procedures must be reliable" (2011). Reliability is established when repeated measurements yield similar conclusions. For this study, intracoder reliability was tested, which means the researcher coded the same set of data twice, at different times, and the consistency was checked using the two sets of results (Wimmer & Dominick, 2011). According to

Neuendorf (2002), reliability scores of .70, or 70 percent, are acceptable for some studies, but .80, or 80 percent is acceptable for most studies, and .90, or 90 percent, are almost always acceptable.

Using the codebook, the researcher coded all 200 posts. At a later time, the researcher coded 20 randomly selected posts, which is 10 percent of the total sample data, to check for reliability. Holsti's formula was used to assess the intracoder reliability. Holsti's formula is M/N , where M stands for the number of coding decisions that the coder agrees with his original coding and N stands for the coder's total number of coding decisions. Using Holsti's formula, any result higher than .80 is acceptable (Holsti, 1969). All the randomly selected posts that were recoded for reliability resulted in a score of better than .80.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted in SPSS and guided by the Gerodimos and Justinussen study (2015) being replicated. First, the researcher determined the frequency with which various messaging strategies were used. Then, the researcher compared the means of emoji reactions, comments and shares across the dichotomous coding categories. In the next step, the researcher ran multiple regression tests. Different message strategies will be treated as independent variables and comments, shares, total emoji reactions and specific emoji reactions – likes, loves, hahas, wows, sads and angrys – will be treated as dependent variables.

Chapter 4: Results

Clinton published a total of 200 posts to her official Facebook account between the dates of Oct. 1, 2016, and Nov. 7, 2016. RQ1 asked what types of message strategies were used by the Clinton campaign for Facebook. To answer RQ1, the posts were analyzed for the presence or absence of 73 independent variables across eight different groupings. Clinton posted at least once per day on each day that was studied, usually more than once. Posts typically were spread out throughout the day, starting in the early morning and ending close to midnight. The number of posts per day increased as Election Day neared. From Oct. 1 to Oct. 29, each day had between one and seven posts, and most of those days had fewer than five posts. Starting on Oct. 30, Clinton posted 10 or more times per day and peaked with 17 posts on Nov. 6. One of the most striking findings was that Clinton posted only videos from Oct. 1 through Oct. 27. Every single post in that time period contained a video of some sort, either live or recorded.

Table 1 shows the frequency of Benoit's Functional Approach in the posts. These are broken down into Acclaim, Acclaim: Character, Acclaim: Policy, Attack, Attack: Character, Attack: Policy and Defense. Of these independent variables, acclaim and attack were used the most frequently, and defense was used the least frequently. Acclaim was present in 107 posts, which is 53.5 percent of the total. Out of all the times Clinton used acclaim in her posts, character and policy acclaims were used relatively evenly, with 85 character acclaims and 72 policy acclaims. There was more of a distinction between the use of character and policy attacks. Out of the total 98 attack posts, 84 were character-

based and 46 were policy-based. Defense was used 13 times, which means it appeared in only 6.5 percent of the 200 posts.

Table 1		
<i>Frequency of Different Types of Benoit's Functional Approach</i>		
<u>All posts (N = 200)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Acclaim	107	53.5
Acclaim: Character	85	42.5
Acclaim: Policy	72	36.0
Attack	98	49.0
Attack: Character	84	42.0
Attack: Policy	46	23.0
Defense	13	6.5

Table 2 shows the frequency of different types of Aristotelian rhetoric used in Clinton's posts. Emotion was used the most frequently; it appeared in 171 posts, or 85.5 percent. Logic was also used quite frequently; it appeared in 144 posts, or 72 percent. Clinton used credibility in less than half of the posts. It appeared 82 times, or 41 percent. Out of the 200 posts, only three did not use a type of Aristotelian rhetoric.

Table 2		
<i>Frequency of Different Types of Aristotelian Rhetoric</i>		
<u>All posts (N = 200)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Logic	144	72.0
Credibility	82	41.0
Emotion	171	85.5
None	3	1.5

Table 3 shows the frequency that Clinton used different types of rhetorical devices. She used calls to action the most frequently, with 132 posts (66 percent) and

urgency the least frequently, with 5 posts (2.5 percent). Calls to action, fact/statistic (n=119), collective appeal (n=98), quotes (n=84) and personal appeal (n=82) were all used in more than 40 percent of the posts. Questions and policy statements were both used in 58 posts each, or 29 percent. Spanish language (n=28), celebrity endorsement (n=25), humor (n=24) and urgency were all used in less than 15 percent of the posts.

<u>All posts (N = 200)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Question	58	29.0
Policy Statement	58	29.0
Fact/Statistic	119	59.5
Collective Appeal	98	49.0
Personal Appeal	82	41.0
Quote	84	42.0
Humor	24	12.0
Celebrity Endorsement	25	12.5
Call to Action	132	66.0
Urgency	5	2.5
Spanish Language	28	14.0

Table 4 shows the frequency of different types of calls to action used in Clinton’s posts. Vote was by far the most-used; it appeared in 75 of the 132 total posts that featured a call to action, or 56.8 percent. The second-most used call to action was find out more. Clinton used that 65 times, which is 49.2 percent of the call-to-action posts. Donate (n=30) and share (n=25) were used occasionally, appearing in 22.7 percent and 18.9 percent of the call-to-action posts respectively. Support/get involved (n=15) and competition (n=2) were both used in less than 12 percent of the call-to-action posts, and buy/offer was not used at all.

Table 4		
<i>Frequency of Different Types of Calls to Action</i>		
<u>All posts (N = 132)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Donate	30	22.7
Buy/Offer	0	0.0
Competition	2	1.5
Vote	75	56.8
Support/Get Involved	15	11.4
Find Out More	65	49.2
Share	25	18.9

Table 5 shows the frequency with which Clinton presented different types of policy themes. Overall, policy themes were not a frequently used topic, and the majority of posts didn't mention any policy themes at all. When policy themes were discussed, women's rights (n=47) and foreign policy (n=45) were presented most frequently; they appeared in 23.5 percent and 22.5 percent of posts respectively. Economy (n=36) and education (n=34) were both used in between 15 and 20 percent of the total posts. Health care (n=27), unemployment (n=20), energy (n=19) and taxes (n=6) were all used in less than 15 percent of the total posts.

Table 5		
<i>Frequency of Different Types of Policy Themes</i>		
<u>All posts (N = 200)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Foreign Policy	45	22.5
Unemployment	20	10.0
Economy	36	18.0
Health Care	27	13.5
Energy	19	9.5
Education	34	17.0
Taxes	6	3.0
Women's Rights	47	23.5

Table 6 shows the frequency of different types of post structures. Clinton used videos (n=124) in the majority of her posts; 62 percent of posts contained a video. In fact, Clinton used a video in every single post from Oct. 1 to Oct. 28. Hyperlinks (n=117) were also used frequently; they appeared in 58.5 percent of posts. Pictures were used in 70 posts, or 35 percent. Clinton used Facebook’s live-video capability 11 times, or 5.5 percent of the total posts. Text-only posts were infrequent; they appeared four times, which is only 2 percent of the total posts.

Table 6		
<i>Frequency of Different Types of Post Structures</i>		
<u>All posts (N = 200)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Video	124	62.0
Live Video	11	5.5
Picture	70	35.0
Text Only	4	2.0
Hyperlink	117	58.5

Table 7 shows the frequency of different types of photo content. Of the 70 photos used, people (n=38) appeared in 54.3 percent and politicians (n=11) appeared in 15.7 percent. Clinton herself appeared more frequently than any other specific person; she was in 35 photos, or 50 percent. Barack Obama (n=9) and Donald Trump (n=8) were visible in 12.9 percent and 11.4 percent of the photo posts respectively. Bill Clinton and Chelsea Clinton were both in one photo (1.4 percent). Tim Kaine and Michelle Obama weren’t featured in any photos. Prompting to share (n=11), policy information (n=8) and quotes (n=7) appeared in between 10 and 16 percent of the photos used. Celebrities (n=3) and maps (n=1) appeared in between 1 and 5 percent of the photos used. No photos featured promotions or event information.

Table 7		
<i>Frequency of Different Types of Photo Content</i>		
All posts (N = 70)	n	%
Hillary Clinton	35	50.0
Bill Clinton	1	1.4
Chelsea Clinton	1	1.4
Tim Kaine	0	0.0
Barack Obama	9	12.9
Michelle Obama	0	0.0
Donald Trump	8	11.4
People	38	54.3
Politicians	11	15.7
Celebrities	3	4.3
Map	1	1.4
Promotion	0	0.0
Policy	8	11.4
Event	0	0.0
Quote	7	10.0
Prompting to Share	11	15.7

Table 8 shows the frequency of different types of video content. Of the 126 videos that Clinton posted, people (n=114) appeared in 90.6 percent, politicians (n=68) appeared in 54.4 percent and celebrities (n=25) appeared in 19.8 percent. Clinton was featured more frequently than any other specific person; she was in 79 videos, or 62.7 percent. Clinton was followed by Donald Trump (n=52), who appeared in 41.3 percent of the videos. Barack Obama (n=20) and Michelle Obama (n=15) were in 15.9 percent and 11.9 percent of the videos respectively. Bill Clinton (n=8), Chelsea Clinton (n=8) and Tim Kaine (n=7) were in between 5 percent and 7 percent of the videos. Quotes appeared in 38 videos (30.2 percent), policy information appeared in 21 videos (16.7 percent) and prompting to share appeared in 8 videos (6.3 percent). A map was used in only one video (0.8 percent), and there were no videos that features promotions or event information.

Table 8		
<i>Frequency of Different Types of Video Content</i>		
<u>All posts (N = 126)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Hillary Clinton	79	62.7
Bill Clinton	8	6.3
Chelsea Clinton	8	6.3
Tim Kaine	7	5.6
Barack Obama	20	15.9
Michelle Obama	15	11.9
Donald Trump	52	41.3
People	114	90.5
Politicians	68	54.4
Celebrities	25	19.8
Map	1	0.8
Promotion	0	0.0
Policy	21	16.7
Event	0	0.0
Quote	38	30.2
Prompting to Share	8	6.3

RQ2 asked which of the message strategies elicited the most interactions via emoji reactions, comments and shares. To answer RQ2, the means were determined for nine different dependent variables across the 73 independent variables in the eight groupings of the study. Means were rounded to the nearest whole number to replicate the formatting of the Gerodimos study. Multiple linear regression tests were then run to see how well the groupings of independent variables correlated with changes in the dependent variables, using Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r). Within the eight groupings, regression results were used to determine which independent variables affected the dependent variables most significantly. Pearson (r) values between 0.5 and 1 were denoted a strong correlation. Values between 0.3 and .49 denoted a mild correlation. Values between 0 and .29 denoted a weak correlation.

Table 9 shows the mean interactions with different types of Benoit's Functional Approach. For this grouping of independent variables, posts displaying defense recorded the highest average means in comments and total emoji reactions. However, the sample size for defense was significantly smaller than other independent variables in the group. Among independent variables with more substantial sample sizes, attack: policy had the highest mean for comments, and acclaim: character had the highest mean for emoji reactions. Attack: policy also had the highest mean for shares. Using Pearson's correlation coefficient, the two dependent variables that exhibited the strongest correlation with this grouping of independent variables were comments ($r=.57$) and loves ($r=.52$). Among comments, attack: character showed the highest likelihood to increase comments, with a beta value of .38 standard deviations above the population mean ($p = .006$), and attack: policy showed the second-highest likelihood ($\beta = .35$, $p = .000$). Within this grouping of independent variables, posts that included character attacks and policy attacks showed the most change in number of comments. For loves, defense produced the highest beta score, of .29 ($p = .000$), with acclaim: character coming in second ($\beta = .277$, $p = .019$). Defense and character acclaims were the two strongest predictors for increased love emoji reactions. The remaining seven dependent variables didn't show strong correlations with the independent variables in this grouping.

Clinton's posts focused more on acclaims for herself and attacks on Donald Trump than on defense. More than half of her posts featured acclaims and nearly half featured attacks. Her posts that featured defense mostly related to Clinton's emails, a story that was heavily covered by the media throughout the campaign. Even though Clinton didn't use defense-type posts frequently, when she did, they tended to illicit more

love emoji reactions, as well as when she described her character. People responded well when Clinton defended herself and propped up her character. On the flip side of that, interactions via comments were also strong when Clinton posted character attacks on Donald Trump. People enjoyed lifting Clinton up and discussing Trump's downfalls. Clinton used acclaim and attack in about the same number of posts, about 50 percent for each, and attack generated more comments and shares than acclaim, but acclaim generated more total emoji reactions than attack. As far as total interactions, acclaim posts earned a mean of 8 percent more interactions than attack posts, which means that on the whole, it resonated more with people when the campaign focused on her strengths rather than attacking Trump's shortcomings. A video that Clinton shared on Nov. 2 served as a good example of how the themes of defense and character acclaim tied in with increased love emoji reactions. The video, in which comedian Louis C.K. talked with late-night host Conan O'Brien, gave Clinton the opportunity to sit back and let somebody else come to her defense while also highlighting her credentials and giving her the chance to show a humorous side through her accompanying written response displayed above the video clip: "Thanks, Louis C.K. — but I prefer 'Madam' Tough Mother." The post received 39 percent more loves than the mean of love reactions for the 200-post population.

<u>All posts</u> <u>(N = 200)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Emoji</u>	<u>Like</u>	<u>Love</u>	<u>Haha</u>	<u>Wow</u>	<u>Sad</u>	<u>Angry</u>
Acclaim	107	53.5	17355	13423	68405	55344	11073	509	266	135	1072
Acclaim: Character	85	42.5	20298	15513	77243	62010	12953	584	304	153	1233
Acclaim: Policy	72	36.0	23203	16237	66880	51800	12704	490	294	152	1433
Attack	98	49.0	18488	17421	55894	42560	8447	808	506	1100	2472
Attack: Character	84	42.0	21006	18505	60982	46128	9435	834	565	1217	2801
Attack: Policy	46	23.0	32205	22490	66781	47212	13245	633	463	2038	3186
Defense	13	6.5	52008	19545	110473	76204	25919	1859	862	333	5279

Table 10 shows the mean interactions with different types of Aristotelian rhetoric. For this grouping of independent variables, posts displaying credibility recorded the highest average means in comments, shares and total emoji reactions. In this grouping, none of the independent variables had strong correlations with any of the dependent variables. Loves ($r = .31$), likes ($r = .30$) and total emoji reactions ($r = .28$) all had similarly mild correlation scores, with credibility being the strongest predictor for increases in loves ($\beta = .29$, $p = .000$), likes ($\beta = .24$, $p = .001$) and emoji reactions ($\beta = .24$, $p = .001$). Across the three strongest correlated dependent variables in this grouping, posts that contained credibility were the strongest predictors for increased interactions.

Which type of Aristotelian rhetoric was displayed in a post had little effect on the amount of reactions a post would get. Interestingly, of the types of Aristotelian rhetoric, the one that Clinton used least, credibility, was the only one to show even a mild correlation with increased interactions. It's possible voters were looking for more focus

on credibility in this election because the presence of logic and emotion were not good indicators of increased interactions.

<u>All posts</u> (N = 200)	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Emoji</u>	<u>Like</u>	<u>Love</u>	<u>Haha</u>	<u>Wow</u>	<u>Sad</u>	<u>Angry</u>
Logic	144	72.0	14527	16260	53666	42456	7685	694	376	727	1725
Credibility	82	41.0	21526	16744	76218	60814	12949	546	333	184	1385
Emotion	171	85.5	13064	15279	60560	49257	8162	668	311	665	1495
None	3	1.5	6180	6762	59194	51128	4405	332	198	1908	1224

Table 11 shows the mean interactions with different types of rhetorical devices. For this grouping of independent variables, posts displaying humor recorded the highest average means in comments and total emoji reactions. Posts containing policy statements had the highest average mean in shares. Posts with policy statements also showed substantially elevated means in comments and total emoji reactions, as well, with a larger sample size than humor. In this grouping, none of the independent variables had strong correlations with any of the dependent variables. Comments ($r = .47$), loves ($r = .42$) and haha reactions ($r = .42$) all had similarly modest correlation scores, with policy statements being the strongest predictor for increases in comments ($\beta = .24$, $p = .001$) and loves ($\beta = .25$, $p = .001$). Posts containing humor were predictably strong indicators of increased haha reactions ($\beta = .37$, $p = .000$). For the two strongest correlated dependent variables in this grouping (comments and loves), posts that contained policy statements were the strongest predictors for increased interactions, while posts that contained humor were the strongest predictors for increased haha reactions.

The use of different rhetorical devices had little effect on the amount of reactions a post would get. The use of policy statements showed a mild correlation with increased interactions, which is interesting because Clinton used them in only a little over a quarter of her posts. Again, it seems people were not reliant on a message's emotional impact to prompt them to interact with it. She used fact/statistic twice as much as she used policy statements, even though people interacted less with fact/statistic posts than policy-statement posts. She focused more on the way things were rather than what she would do about them.

<u>All posts</u> <u>(N = 200)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Emoji</u>	<u>Like</u>	<u>Love</u>	<u>Haha</u>	<u>Wow</u>	<u>Sad</u>	<u>Angry</u>
Question	58	29.0	18251	14146	55708	43600	9209	785	258	417	1433
Policy Statement	58	29.0	27464	18693	68970	51794	14313	633	298	218	1707
Fact/Statistic	119	59.5	14758	13972	49183	38685	6911	660	354	773	1798
Collective Appeal	98	49.0	18694	14430	64763	51305	10985	570	292	209	1397
Personal Appeal	82	41.0	21062	9880	62697	49632	10243	769	292	223	1534
Quote	84	42.0	7977	11441	49786	41746	5805	359	285	436	1153
Humor	24	12.0	42561	13073	81464	59252	17136	2036	333	188	2510
Celebrity Endorsement	25	12.5	26995	9581	70872	54503	13188	1135	267	133	1639
Call to Action	132	66.0	15172	13768	59050	47624	8653	736	341	278	1413
Urgency	5	2.5	35295	10928	77357	54588	19637	575	375	295	1879
Spanish Language	28	14.0	7767	8542	27715	22695	3924	151	85	218	641

Table 12 shows the mean interactions with different types of calls to action. For this grouping of independent variables, posts displaying support/get involved recorded the highest average means in comments, shares and total emoji reactions. Of the two independent variables that appeared in at least half of the call-to-action posts (vote and

find out more), posts that prompted people to vote displayed higher means for interactions. Using Pearson's correlation coefficient, the two dependent variables that exhibited the strongest correlation with this grouping of independent variables were comments ($r=.64$) and loves ($r=.57$). Among comments, support/get involved showed the highest likelihood to increase comments, with a beta value of .62 standard deviations above the population mean ($p = .000$). For loves, support/get involved also produced the highest beta score, of .52 ($p= .000$). Posts that encouraged viewers to support/get involved showed a high likelihood to increase the numbers of comments and loves in a post. The remaining seven dependent variables didn't show strong correlations with the independent variables in this grouping.

Only one call to action showed a significant increase in people interacting with the post via comments and love reactions, and that was urging people to support/get involved. Support/get involved was used infrequently by Clinton compared to other calls to action, including vote and find out more. Urging people to vote is an interesting call to action for this study, though, because it could have had an effect on people's choice to vote, but that wouldn't be apparent via the social reactions available on Facebook. The same could be said for find out more. If people clicked through to further information, they would have been directed to a new website, which could lower their likelihood of interacting with the original post.

<u>All posts</u> (N = 132)	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Emoji</u>	<u>Like</u>	<u>Love</u>	<u>Haha</u>	<u>Wow</u>	<u>Sad</u>	<u>Angry</u>
Donate	30	22.7	5698	14332	38292	32110	3100	739	303	536	1505
Buy/Offer	0	0.0									
Competition	2	1.5	3669	480	17570	15522	1577	234	37	10	193
Vote	75	56.8	22439	15730	68036	52600	12532	693	313	260	1631
Support/Get Involved	15	11.4	86054	19480	148945	103730	37765	1120	766	404	5136
Find Out More	65	49.2	18345	11045	64063	51652	9356	730	428	143	1748
Share	25	18.9	25860	14792	80583	62869	14347	1078	389	177	1714

Table 13 shows the mean interactions with different types of policy themes. None of the policy themes appeared in more than a quarter of the total posts, but for this grouping of independent variables, posts displaying energy recorded the highest average means in comments and total emoji reactions. Posts containing foreign policy recoded the highest average mean in shares. Using Pearson’s correlation coefficient, the two dependent variables that exhibited the strongest correlation with this grouping of independent variables were comments ($r=.62$) and loves ($r=.50$). Among comments, energy ($\beta=.33$, $p=.000$) and unemployment ($\beta=.32$, $p=.000$) showed similar high likelihoods to increase comments. For loves, energy produced the highest beta score, of $.30$ ($p=.001$). Posts that touched on the policy theme of energy showed the strongest likelihood to increase comments and loves, while posts containing the theme of unemployment also had a strong likelihood to increase comments. The remaining seven dependent variables didn’t show strong correlations with the independent variables in this grouping.

Clinton did not post about policy themes frequently, and when she did, the message tended to focus on foreign policy or women’s rights. However, the data shows

that Clinton should have spent more time discussing energy, as that topic increased the likelihood of interactions via comments and love reactions. The only other policy theme that had a significant effect on interactions was unemployment, which had a strong likelihood of increasing comments. All the different categories of policy themes exhibited mean comments and total emoji reactions that were higher than the population of 200 posts as a whole, so although it wasn't a device that she used often, substantive posts about policy generally received increased interaction.

Table 13

Mean Interaction with Different Types of Policy Themes

<u>All posts</u> (N = 200)	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Emoji</u>	<u>Like</u>	<u>Love</u>	<u>Haha</u>	<u>Wow</u>	<u>Sad</u>	<u>Angry</u>
Foreign Policy	45	22.5	26495	29782	71668	53246	12568	660	516	1933	2741
Unemployment	20	10.0	64895	12353	93712	62085	26005	874	507	300	3923
Economy	36	18.0	41736	21592	85861	61531	20530	670	396	231	2489
Health Care	27	13.5	42293	21894	86709	62165	20424	814	410	244	2639
Energy	19	9.5	69485	26673	112097	75771	30525	866	614	364	3937
Education	34	17.0	41307	12608	79555	57275	18562	837	326	187	2359
Taxes	6	3.0	42099	7681	73740	51635	18206	623	470	155	2642
Women's Rights	47	23.5	32236	20134	76256	56616	15881	713	381	357	2300

Table 14 shows the mean interactions with different types of post structures. For this grouping of independent variables, posts with live videos exhibited far higher means in comments, shares and total emoji reactions than other types of post structures. This is likely because people were interacting with a live event and one another throughout the course of the event. Of the non-live post structures, videos had the highest means of comments and shares, and pictures had the highest mean of total emoji reactions. Using Pearson's correlation coefficient, the two dependent variables that exhibited the strongest correlation with this grouping of independent variables were comments ($r=.80$) and loves

($r=.63$). Among comments, live video showed a very high likelihood to increase comments ($\beta=.83$, $p=.000$). Live video also produced the highest beta score for loves ($\beta=.66$, $p=.000$). Video ($\beta=.60$, $p=.000$) had a slightly higher beta coefficient than picture ($\beta=.60$, $p=.000$) in comments, but picture ($\beta=.45$, $p=.028$) had a higher coefficient in loves than video ($\beta=.42$, $p=.038$). While live video was a strong predictor of increased interaction across all dependent variables, video had a stronger impact on the comments while picture was stronger on love reactions. The remaining seven dependent variables didn't show strong correlations with the independent variables in this grouping.

Live videos elicited, by far, the most interactions out of any other post structure. Clinton's eleven live videos consistently had tens of thousands more interactions than any of the other 189 posts. By means, this was seen most dramatically in comments and total emoji reactions. With her live videos, which typically showed live speeches and rallies and usually featured other prominent politicians and celebrities, Clinton gave people a place to discuss the election in real-time with others from across the country, and people really took advantage of that opportunity. A live video on Nov. 7 showcased the power of live videos for Clinton. The 63-minute live video of a rally, which featured celebrity Lady Gaga, Bill Clinton, Chelsea Clinton and Clinton herself, gave Clinton ample opportunity to talk about her credentials for the presidency; touch on policy themes, such as energy and unemployment; encourage people to support/get involved with the campaign; and other signifiers that correlated strongly with increased interactions throughout the 200 posts in the study. Clinton seemed to embrace the necessity of visuals to grab people's attention, showcased by the fact that there were only four posts that did not include a photo or video.

<u>All posts</u> (N = 200)	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Emoji</u>	<u>Like</u>	<u>Love</u>	<u>Haha</u>	<u>Wow</u>	<u>Sad</u>	<u>Angry</u>
Video	124	62.0	15136	18178	54138	42204	8366	651	296	874	1745
Live Video	11	5.5	121829	19947	158710	100285	48595	1387	874	542	6999
Picture	70	35.0	5902	7032	62790	55345	5323	624	424	94	978
Text Only	4	2.0	5931	2899	31828	28306	2753	303	115	121	230
Hyperlink	117	58.5	11261	8452	54195	45560	6564	508	313	90	1157

Table 15 shows the mean interactions with different types of photo content. For this grouping of independent variables, photos that included celebrities had the highest mean number of comments. Photos that prompted people to share had the highest mean number of shares. Photos containing Bill Clinton and Chelsea Clinton had the highest mean number of total emoji reactions. That is a little misleading, though, because the sample size for Bill and Chelsea is one photo in which both of them are in it with Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama. In fact, sample size is an issue throughout this grouping because only Hillary Clinton and the generic independent variable of people appear in at least half of the photos. Using Pearson's correlation coefficient, the four dependent variables that exhibited the strongest correlation with this grouping of independent variables were loves ($r=.66$), likes ($r=.65$), total emoji reaction ($r=.64$) and haha reaction ($r=.56$). Sad reactions had an extremely high correlation coefficient ($r=.94$), but that figure is skewed by the picture of the three Clintons and Obama, which garnered at least seven times the number of sad reactions than any of the other photo content variables' means. Among emojis ($\beta=.44$, $p=.000$), likes ($\beta=.46$, $p=.000$) and loves ($\beta=.42$, $p=.000$), photos containing Hillary Clinton showed a high likelihood to increase interactions. Among haha reactions, photos containing Donald Trump held the highest likelihood to increase interactions ($\beta=.64$, $p=.000$). The candidate was a strong predictor

for people liking, loving and selecting emojis for picture content, while her opponent was a strong predictor for haha reactions. The remaining four dependent variables didn't show strong correlations with the independent variables in this grouping.

When the candidate posted a photo, she was present in half of them, and data showed that people responded positively to her image using emoji reactions. People also showed a sense of humor about Clinton's opponent. When Donald Trump was in a photo, haha reactions were likely to increase. It's unclear if this would have been true of any other opponent, but it does show that Clinton had an idea of what voters would respond to when it came to images of Donald Trump specifically.

Table 15

Mean Interaction with Different Types of Photo Content

<u>All posts</u> <u>(N = 70)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Emoji</u>	<u>Like</u>	<u>Love</u>	<u>Haha</u>	<u>Wow</u>	<u>Sad</u>	<u>Angry</u>
Hillary Clinton	35	50.0	5839	8188	94523	84577	8756	491	248	98	352
Bill Clinton	1	1.4	4261	10764	209914	183808	22854	354	512	1999	387
Chelsea Clinton	1	1.4	4261	10764	209914	183808	22854	354	512	1999	387
Tim Kaine	0	0.0									
Barack Obama	9	12.9	6097	9721	107452	95305	10577	576	380	272	342
Michelle Obama	0	0.0									
Donald Trump	8	11.4	5592	6748	35938	28801	1600	2149	1147	199	2043
People	38	54.3	5518	7148	68372	60180	6063	635	322	106	1066
Politicians	11	15.7	5814	8511	86035	75410	8132	534	535	286	1138
Celebrities	3	4.3	6968	9670	158876	141793	15537	590	486	53	416
Map	1	1.4	4908	1805	27485	25270	1684	338	60	12	121
Promotion	0	0.0									
Policy	8	11.4	4995	6361	55492	49825	4855	295	91	36	390
Event	0	0.0									
Quote	7	10.0	5390	6803	78823	70228	7629	376	219	36	336
Prompting to Share	11	15.7	5745	11458	46703	41300	3425	1344	106	46	479

Table 16 shows the mean interactions with different types of video content. For this grouping of independent variables, videos that featured Chelsea Clinton had the highest mean number of comments, and videos that included Bill Clinton had the highest mean number of shares and total emoji reactions. That is a little misleading, though, because the sample size for Bill and Chelsea is only eight videos each. Like photo content, sample size is an issue throughout this grouping because only Hillary Clinton, people and politicians appear in at least half of the videos. Using Pearson's correlation coefficient, the five dependent variables that exhibited the strongest correlation with this grouping of independent variables were loves ($r=.70$), comments ($r=.58$), total emoji reactions ($r=.55$), wow reactions ($r=.55$) and likes ($r=.52$). Among total emoji reactions ($\beta=.24$, $p=.014$), likes ($\beta=.22$, $p=.031$) and loves ($\beta=.29$, $p=.001$), videos containing Chelsea Clinton showed the highest likelihood to increase interactions. Bill Clinton was close behind in total emoji reactions ($\beta=.21$, $p=.040$) and loves ($\beta=.26$, $p=.003$). For comments, videos that included policy ($\beta=.24$, $p=.005$) and prompting to share ($\beta=.22$, $p=.010$) held the highest likelihood for increased interactions, while videos with prompts to share also had a strong relationship with increased wow reactions ($\beta=.33$, $p=.000$). Chelsea's and Bill's presence meant an increased likelihood for emotional reactions, while policy statements and prompts to share brought more comments. The remaining four dependent variables didn't show strong correlations with the independent variables in this grouping.

The content of videos was more widely distributed than the content of photos. Videos were more likely to include people other than Clinton, most notably Donald Trump, Barack Obama and Michelle Obama. The fact that Clinton posted 126 videos in a

handful of weeks shows she had more confidence in messaging being received via images than via text. The sheer number of videos allowed her to tell wide-ranging stories and test out different message topics. This seems to have worked well for Clinton because video content showed more strong correlations with different dependent variables than any other grouping. Specifically, people interacted strongly via emoji reactions with Clinton’s family members, and it’s likely Clinton could have benefitted from more use of Bill and Chelsea in her messaging. Clinton used Trump in 52 videos and didn’t use Democratic surrogates in near that many. Barack Obama appeared in 20, Michelle Obama appeared 15, and Bill and Chelsea each appeared in eight. Although Trump appeared more frequently than Democratic figures and prominent Clinton allies, videos featuring Trump didn’t garner near the number of interactions.

Table 16

Mean Interactions with Different Types of Video Content

<u>All posts</u> <u>(N = 126)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Emoji</u>	<u>Like</u>	<u>Love</u>	<u>Haha</u>	<u>Wow</u>	<u>Sad</u>	<u>Angry</u>
Hillary Clinton	79	62.7	20310	17365	63485	48994	11714	653	312	370	1436
Bill Clinton	8	6.3	72468	72936	172393	117643	48086	955	930	540	4213
Chelsea Clinton	8	6.3	77457	65245	170456	115192	48304	1011	897	688	4338
Tim Kaine	7	5.6	9800	64393	81209	62967	14145	1213	529	950	1393
Barack Obama	20	15.9	29645	31089	89580	67104	19381	605	377	212	1892
Michelle Obama	15	11.9	31420	40935	110770	83343	24003	566	445	284	2118
Donald Trump	52	41.3	6289	22802	43887	35378	3281	613	382	1884	2352
People	114	90.5	16674	17805	53577	41256	8678	535	306	945	1855
Politicians	68	54.4	17733	25050	61139	46808	9796	690	373	1324	2145
Celebrities	25	19.8	27419	14081	60495	44186	12955	1106	258	153	1830
Map	1	0.8	6423	11887	76542	68517	6928	554	195	54	294
Promotion	0	0.0									
Policy	21	16.7	49688	28567	94339	65644	23728	730	509	324	3389
Event	0	0.0									
Quote	38	30.2	5572	11317	37710	31229	3662	310	315	644	1548
Prompting to Share	8	6.3	67217	18569	109539	69253	33386	1041	990	445	4409

Chapter 5: Discussion

This study sought to discover what message strategies Clinton used on her official Facebook page during the 2016 election, as well as which of those message strategies increased the number of post interactions via emojis, comments and shares. The findings provide valuable information about the field of political communication through Facebook that can be used by practitioners in future elections. Limitations do exist in this study, and some questions were also raised that would benefit from future research.

The research presented in this thesis was guided by the 2015 Gerodimos and Justinussen study that examined the role that social media played in Barack Obama's 2012 campaign, with a focus on the role of Facebook's social buttons (like, comment and share) as tools of political voice. A content analysis was performed on Obama's Facebook posts during the two months prior to the election, and people's responses via social buttons to different message strategies were examined as measures of civic engagement. Facebook implemented one big change in the social buttons available to users between 2012 and 2016 by adding the different emoji reactions. Instead of just a like button, people in 2016 had several different emoji reactions to choose from that covered a range of emotional reactions. Just like in this study of Clinton's Facebook posts, Gerodimos' and Justinussen's research found that people were selective with the messages they chose to interact with. Both studies found that likes and emoji reactions were typically the social button used most, likely because it is the easiest way to engage with a post and only takes one click. Both studies also found, however, that certain topics or events would elicit spikes in the use of comments or shares, which suggests that it's

not only the ease of use that affects the use of each social button. For example, live videos consistently garnered Clinton hundreds of thousands of comments, far more than she got on other post types.

One major difference between Obama's use of Facebook in 2012 and Clinton's use of Facebook in 2016 was post structure. Obama used far more picture posts than Clinton. The vast majority of Obama's posts featured a single photo along with a caption, text or commentary. Clinton, on the other hand, embraced the use of videos, a trend that exploded across the web in the time since the 2012 election. The vast majority of Clinton's posts featured a short video with a small amount of accompanying text. Facebook users' interactions with videos also changed in the four years between elections. In 2012, Obama's posts that featured a video had a statistically significant negative correlation with the number of likes, comments and shares. By 2016, the presence of a video increased interactions with Clinton's posts.

Another notable difference between Obama's 2012 Facebook posts and Clinton's 2016 Facebook posts was that Obama kept his posts mostly positive with very little use of attacks or defensive responses. Clinton frequently used attack messaging against Donald Trump. She posted defense-based messaging, as well, mostly in response to the controversy over her emails.

Obama and Clinton both preferred using emotions and credibility in their messaging over logical arguments. Obama used far more quotes than Clinton to this end, however; nearly one-third of his posts included a quote, and he frequently used them as a way to boost his credibility using emotive language. Clinton, on the other hand, did not use quotes very frequently. One reason for this is likely her use of videos. Instead of

using quotes in text, her videos served to get those messages across using the actual speaker speaking the words.

Obama and Clinton shared a similarity in their use of character-based messaging over policy-based messaging. Obama's posts, specifically, heavily featured his personality and family. It's clear that both Obama and Clinton had sharp strategies and focused on using Facebook as a tool for promoting their agendas and mobilizing voters. However, despite the personal and personable versions that Obama and Clinton presented of themselves on Facebook, it's also clear that they were not looking for two-way communication with Facebook users. A good example of this is Obama's and Clinton's use of questions in their posts. Rarely were questions substantive or seemingly looking for actual responses. Questions used were more rhetorical or breezy and didn't seem to be expecting thoughtful responses or feedback. The nature of social media makes a two-way conversation possible and, although the sheer number of responses received on posts would make it a difficult task, candidates might consider developing more of a discussion with users who are interacting with their posts. This would lead to questions about who is setting the agenda, as well. One of the big benefits of social media to political campaigns is that they have real-time access to data that show how their posts are doing. These analytics allow campaigns to make adjustments to their messaging strategies as the election goes on depending on how their posts are performing and how many and what type of interactions they are receiving. This direct link to voters helps them set the agenda during an election, but it also creates the possibility of giving voters more of an opportunity to set the agenda if campaigns make adjustments to their messaging based on the reaction they are receiving from voters.

It's unclear whether Obama or Clinton made adjustments to their Facebook messaging strategies based on analytics during their campaigns. However, the benefit of a candidate interacting more with voters who are engaging with his or her messaging, as well as making adjustments to messaging strategy based on what is performing well in terms of increased interactions, would be higher message saturation and intensity. Making those changes would increase interactions, and the more a post is interacted with, the farther it will spread on Facebook, for example. This is important because the receive-accept-sample theory (Zaller, 1992) shows that when someone sees information that was shared via low-threshold activities, such as content shared by friends on Facebook, it can improve the reception of campaigns' messaging and when people hear a message from someone they know, it increases acceptance because of the high credibility of social ties (Vaccari, 2013).

Across several groupings of independent variables, love emoji reactions had strong correlations with rising engagement. That could display that users who employ the love reaction are more passionate about interacting with the specific posts with which they choose to interact. To use the love emoji button, there are extra steps a person must take than to use the like emoji button. That extra investment of time and effort could explain why love has a stronger correlation with increased interaction than like.

Limitations and opportunities for future research

This survey has several limitations. Some of the limitations are due to the necessity of keeping the sample size manageable. Included in that category, first, is the fact that this is a snapshot only of Clinton's Facebook messaging. Her strategies on other

social media platforms weren't examined for similarities and differences, and, similarly, users' reactions to her messaging on the other platforms weren't collected or examined. Her Facebook strategy was a small portion of her overall campaign messaging, which included other social media platforms, websites, television advertising, promotional appearances, rallies and many other multimedia activities. Second, this snapshot also is limited in its timeframe. The Clinton campaign started long before October 1, but the sample size would have become unmanageable if the timeframe were extended. Third, it was not possible to record and analyze the content of the comments on Clinton's post due to the sheer amount that each post received. The collection of that data would be helpful in establishing a deeper qualitative understanding of the types of reactions Clinton was receiving on her messaging. Along the same lines, the different emoji reactions weren't treated differently or examined based on their positive or negative connotations. Some emoji reactions could have different meanings based on the specific post and the particular person reacting to it. For example, a post criticizing Donald Trump could receive a love reaction from a Clinton supporter and an angry reaction from a Trump supporter. There are other factors that could affect a person's decision to interact with a post, as well, that were not taken into account. Some people are simply more likely to engage with Facebook posts, political or otherwise. The context of the posts could have affected the reaction types and amounts, as well. A person's name is attached to everything they react to on Facebook, so some thought usually goes into what to interact, and not interact, with. The fact that these are political posts, specifically, could also have an effect. Some people do not like their political beliefs to be public, so they don't react to political content on Facebook because then their friends and, depending on the

person's security settings on Facebook, the public could see those reactions.

Alternatively, some people might react with political content because they want others to know what they think and they want the posts' content shared into their friends' newsfeeds. The number of steps it takes to use the different social buttons also affects their use. It's easier to click on like, than it is to comment, and those extra steps could have had an impact on people decision about whether and how to react to a post.

There are many possibilities for future research on this topic. Research is needed to determine users' motivations for interacting via Facebook's social buttons. This is especially true for the emoji reactions since they are the newest social-button available on Facebook and the meaning behind people's use of them is still being established. The emoji reactions allow a more nuanced response, but the meaning behind each reaction on different types of posts is something that is fluid. The way people use the emoji reactions varies by post, and the same emoji could mean different things based on the post it is responding to. For example, two main motivations behind clicking the angry emoji could be taking exception to the content of the post or taking exception to the existence of the post itself. Similarly, the haha emoji could indicate either laughing at a post's content or laughing at the expense of a post's content. Additionally, research into people's decision-making process when determining whether to use one of the social buttons and which one to use is something that is constantly evolving as social media evolves, so research into that process is needed on a regular basis. Research is also needed on the differences in Clinton's strategy on different social media platforms and the differences in the ways in which users interacted with those messages on each platform. Do Twitter users interact differently than Facebook users? What about Instagram users? Further research is also

necessary to determine how much the use of social buttons on a candidate's Facebook page translates into real-world actions, such as voting, donating or volunteering for a campaign.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This study used content analysis to examine the users' interactions with Hillary Clinton's Facebook posts between October 1, 2016, and November 7, 2016. Data on Clinton's use of different types of message strategies were collected, and the frequency of each strategy was discussed. Additionally, the research determined which message strategies were associated with increased interactions via the social buttons of emoji reactions, shares and comments. The relationship between different message strategies and the level of engagement was discussed in the context of social media's role in modern American politics. It's important for campaigns to know what message strategies increase interactions because the more interactions a post receives, the more people see that post. According to the receive-accept-sample model of information processing, exposure to a message can affect people's opinions and behaviors, so campaigns benefit from increased views of their messaging. The data indicated that people like real-time interactions with each other and feeling like they are at an event even if they are at home. This was seen in the extremely high number of comments on live videos. People also were more willing to listen to policy than Clinton might have thought because policy posts received higher interaction levels even though Clinton used them sparingly. People are more interested in hearing acclaims about their candidate than attacks on the opposing candidate. Pictures with Clinton in them got a lot of love reactions, and acclaim posts had more interactions than attack posts. Since Obama's campaign in 2012, changing political landscapes and technology altered people's preferences, seen most notably in the rise of video posts. It will be interesting to see how this changes by 2020.

References

- Bode, L. (2012). Facebooking It to the Polls: A Study in Online Social Networking and Political Behavior. *Journal Of Information Technology & Politics*, 9(4), 352-369. doi:10.1080/19331681.2012.709045
- Brader, T. (2005). Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions. *American Journal Of Political Science*, 49(2), 388-405. doi:10.1111/j.0092-5853.2005.00130.x
- Bronstein, J. (2013). Like me! Analyzing the 2012 presidential candidates' Facebook pages. *Online Information Review*, 37(2), 173-192. doi:10.1108/OIR-01-2013-0002
- Carpenter, C. A. (2010). The Obamachine: Technopolitics 2.0. *Journal Of Information Technology & Politics*, 7(2/3), 216-225. doi:10.1080/19331681003765887
- Carr, D. (2008, November 9). How Obama tapped into social networks' power. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/10/business/media/10carr.html?_r=0
- Dalton, R. J., Beck, P., & Huckfeldt, R. (1998). A test of media-centered agenda setting: newspaper content and public interests in a presidential election. *Political Communication*, 15(4), 463-481.
- Gallup. (2012). *Election 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/125843/election-2012.aspx>
- Gerlitz, C., & Helmond, A. (2013). The like economy: Social buttons and the data-intensive web. *New Media & Society*, 15(8), 1348-1365. doi:10.1177/1461444812472322
- Gerodimos, R., & Justinussen, J. (2015). Obama's 2012 Facebook Campaign: Political Communication in the Age of the Like Button. *Journal Of Information Technology & Politics*, 12(2), 113-132. doi:10.1080/19331681.2014.982266
- Gould, L. L. (2003). *The Modern American Presidency*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press
- Hajli, M. (2014). A study of the impact of social media on consumers. *International Journal Of Market Research*, 56(3), 387-404. doi:10.2501/IJMR-2014-025
- Himmelboim, I., Lariscy, R. W., Tinkham, S. F., & Sweetser, K. D. (2012). *Social Media and Online Political Communication: The Role of Interpersonal Informational*

- Trust and Openness. *Journal Of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 56(1), 92-115. doi:10.1080/08838151.2011.648682
- Holsti, O. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Impact and Legacy. (n.d.). In *American President: A Reference Resource* from University of Virginia Miller Center. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/president/fdroosevelt/essays/biography/9>
- Miller, C. C. (2008, November 7). How Obama's Internet campaign changed politics. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://bits.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/11/07/how-obamas-internet-campaign-changed-politics/>
- NBC News. (2012). *Presidential election results*. Retrieved from <http://elections.nbcnews.com/ns/politics/2012/all/president/#.WNwosYWDMdJ>
- Neuendorf, K. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Park, H., Rodgers, S., & Stemmler, J. (2011). Health organizations' use of Facebook for health advertising and promotion. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 12(1), 62-77.
- Pew Research Center. (2016). *Newspapers: Daily readership by age*. Retrieved from <http://www.journalism.org/media-indicators/newspapers-daily-readership-by-age/>
- Pew Research Center. (2017). *Social media fact sheet*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/social-media/>
- Prager, D. (2014, March 11). *How to set measurable goals for your social media marketing*. Retrieved from <https://unbounce.com/social-media/how-do-you-measure-your-social-media-marketing/>
- Shaffer, H. B. (1955). Television and the 1956 campaign. *Editorial research reports 1955* (Vol. II). Washington, DC: CQ Press. Retrieved from <http://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/cqresrre1955090600>
- Spaeth, M. (2009). Presidential Politics and Public Relations in 2008: Marshall McLuhan 2.0. *Journalism Studies*, 10(3), 438-443. doi:10.1080/14616700902987264
- Takaragawa, S., & Carty, V. (2012). The 2008 U.S. Presidential Election and New Digital Technologies: Political Campaigns as Social Movements and the Significance of Collective Identity. *Tamara Journal For Critical Organization Inquiry*, 10(4), 73-89.

- Triadafilopoulos, T. (1999). Politics, Speech, and the Art of Persuasion: Toward an Aristotelian Conception of the Public Sphere. *The Journal of Politics*, 61(3), 741-757. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/stable/2647826>
- Vaccari, C. (2013). From echo chamber to persuasive device? Rethinking the role of the Internet in campaigns. *New Media and Society*, 15(1), 109–127. Doi:10.1177/1461444812457336
- Vitak, J., Zube, P., Smock, A., Carr, C. T., Ellison, N., & Lampe, C. (2011). It's Complicated: Facebook Users' Political Participation in the 2008 Election. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking*, 14(3), 107-114. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2009.0226
- Wasserman, T. (2012, September 28). *Sorry, marketers, you're doing Facebook wrong*. Retrieved from <http://mashable.com/2012/09/28/marketers-facebook-wrong/#q5AoO4gnRGqV>
- Wimmer, R.D., & Dominick, J. R. (2011). *Mass media research: An introduction* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Wojcieszak, M. E., & Mutz, D. C. (2009). Online Groups and Political Discourse: Do Online Discussion Spaces Facilitate Exposure to Political Disagreement? *Journal Of Communication*, 59(1), 40-56. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01403.x
- Zaller, J. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. Cambridge, England; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Coding Instructions

1. Date and time of post (ex: MM/DD/YY at X:XX x.m.) — Please indicate the day, month and year of the Facebook post you are coding. The date can be found at the top left of the post. Please provide the date in the following format: Month/Date/Year (ex: 11/01/16). Please also indicate the time of the post following the date and the word “at.” The time of the post can be found by hovering your mouse over the date of the post. Please provide the time in the following format: X:XX x.m. (ex: 9:30 a.m.) An example of the correct time and date format for each post: 11/01/16 at 9:30 a.m.
2. Number of emoji reactions on post — Please indicate the total number of emoji reactions on the post you are analyzing. The number of emoji reactions can be found by hovering your mouse over each emoji reaction on the left side of the post. A list of people who used each emoji reaction will appear, and at the bottom of the list, it will say the number of uses in addition to the names you can see listed. Count the number of names listed and add it to the number of additional uses indicated. For example, if there are 19 names listed, and below those names, it says, “and 391,048 more,” then the total number of uses for that post is 391,067.
3. Number of comments on post — Please indicate the total number of comments on the post you are analyzing. The number of comments can be found in the bottom right corner of the post. For example, if the post says, “2 of 3,039,” then that means there is a total of 3,039 comments on that post.
4. Number of shares on post — Please indicate the total number of shares on the post you are analyzing. The number of shares can be found on the left side of the post above the comment section. For example, if the post says, “983 shares,” then that means there is a total of 983 shares on that post.
5. Benoit’s functional approach — Please indicate whether the post uses Benoit’s functional approach. To do so, read the post thoroughly and determine whether each of the following functional approaches are present or not present. The definitions for each functional approach are below.
 - a. Acclaim — Themes that portray the candidate in a positive light through either policy or character acclaims.

0 Not present

1 Present

b. Acclaim (person) — Themes that portray the candidate in a positive light through character acclaims.

0 Not present

1 Present

c. Acclaim (policy) — Themes that portray the candidate in a positive light through policy acclaims.

0 Not present

1 Present

d. Attack — Themes that portray the opposing candidate in an unfavorable way through either policy or character attacks.

0 Not present

1 Present

e. Attack (person) — Themes that portray the opposing candidate in an unfavorable way through character attacks.

0 Not present

1 Present

f. Attack (policy) — Themes that portray the opposing candidate in an unfavorable way through policy attacks.

0 Not present

1 Present

g. Defense — Themes that explicitly respond to a prior attack on the candidate.

0 Not present

1 Present

6. Aristotelian rhetoric — Please indicate whether the post uses Aristotelian rhetoric. To do so, read the post thoroughly and determine whether each of the following modes of persuasion are present or not present. The definitions for each mode of persuasion are below.

a. Logic (Logos) — Appeal to rational thinking, using facts, statistics, or logical arguments.

0 Not present

1 Present

b. Credibility (Ethos) — Credibility appeal, where candidate is positioned as expert, or an expert (e.g. other politician) is quoted. Focus on Clinton’s authority as longtime politician, character traits, etc., making her appear more credible.

0 Not present

1 Present

c. Emotion (Pathos) — Emotional appeal. Messages identifying with the reader and focusing on consequences, fear, flattery, pity, ridicule, spite, wishful thinking, hope, etc. Uses emotive language, soft adjectives (i.e. strong, reckless, important) and words like dream, forward, back. Also involves pictures appealing emotionally to readers e.g. where Clinton connects with voters or appears as a normal person.

0 Not present

1 Present

d. None — Absence of credibility, emotional and logical appeal.

0 Not present

1 Present

7. Rhetorical device — Please indicate whether the following rhetorical devices are present or not present in the post. To do so, read the post thoroughly and determine whether each of the following rhetorical devices are used. The definitions for each rhetorical device are below.

a. Question — Posts explicitly asking the reader a question.

0 Not present

1 Present

- b. Policy statement — Statements with political content as opposed to anecdotes or references to the horserace itself. This does not include vague statements, such as “We need to move forward.”

0 Not present

1 Present

- c. Fact/statistic — Use of factual information or statistics to make a point. Does not include mere claims about an issue.

0 Not present

1 Present

- d. Collective appeal — Posts associating Clinton with the reader, or collectively associating the American people or Clinton’s supporters, using we, us or our to include the reader in the process. Does not include general “we” statements that seem to refer to a collective entity excluding the reader (e.g. we, the First Family). Example: We need to move forward.

0 Not present

1 Present

- e. Personal appeal — Posts directed at the reader, using the word you. This does not include “we” remarks or general calls to action with no pronouns. Example: Are you with us?

0 Not present

1 Present

- f. Quote — Quotes either made explicitly in quotation marks or without but appearing to be spoken by an individual person.

0 Not present

1 Present

- g. Humor — Use of irony, seeking to elicit laughter from the reader.

0 Not present

1 Present

h. Celebrity endorsement — Posts featuring a celebrity endorsing Clinton.

0 Not present

1 Present

i. Call to action — The use of imperative mood in the sentence structure toward the reader, prompting some sort of action in response to the post.

0 Not present

1 Present

j. Urgency — Highlighting a sense of urgency to act or respond, using words, such as now, today and last call.

0 Not present

1 Present

k. Spanish language — Posts featuring the use of Spanish language.

0 Not present

1 Present

8. Call to action — Please indicate whether the following calls to action are present or not present in the post. To do so, read the post thoroughly and determine whether each of the following calls to action are used. The definitions for each call to action are below.

a. Donate — Call to donate money to the Clinton campaign.

0 Not present

1 Present

b. Buy/Offer — Call to get a product from the Clinton store, featuring promotions of campaign materials. Example: Get your free bumper sticker.

0 Not present

1 Present

- c. Competition — Call to join a competition e.g. to win a dinner with the president.

0 Not present

1 Present

- d. Vote — Register to vote, commit to vote or confirm your voting place.

0 Not present

1 Present

- e. Support/Get Involved — Call to get involved, volunteer and generic “show support” encouragements. Example: Keep us moving forward.

0 Not present

1 Present

- f. Find out more — Encouragement to seek information about campaign, policies or stay tuned about the campaign.

0 Not present

1 Present

- g. Share — Prompting the reader to share or tell friends.

0 Not present

1 Present

9. Policy themes — Please indicate whether the following policy themes are present or not present in the post. To do so, read the post thoroughly and determine whether each of the following policy themes are used. The definitions for each policy theme are below.

- a. Foreign policy

0 Not present

1 Present

b. Unemployment

0 Not present

1 Present

c. Economy

0 Not present

1 Present

d. Health care

0 Not present

1 Present

e. Energy

0 Not present

1 Present

f. Education

0 Not present

1 Present

g. Taxes

0 Not present

1 Present

h. Women's rights

0 Not present

1 Present

10. Post structure — Please indicate whether the following structural items are present or not present in the post. To do so, read the post thoroughly and

determine whether each of the following structural items are used. The definitions for each structural item are below.

a. Video — Posts featuring a video.

0 Not present

1 Present

b. Live Video — Posts featuring a live video.

0 Not present

1 Present

c. Picture — Posts featuring a picture.

0 Not present

1 Present

d. Text only — Posts with no multimedia content (picture or video).

0 Not present

1 Present

e. Hyperlink — Posts with a hyperlink to an external site.

0 Not present

1 Present

11. Photo content — If the post contains a photo, then please indicate whether the following people and/or things are present or not present in the post. To do so, examine the photo thoroughly and determine whether each of the following people and/or things are used. The definitions for each person and/or thing are below.

a. Hillary Clinton — Picture of Hillary Clinton.

0 Not present

1 Present

- b. Bill Clinton — Picture of Bill Clinton.
 - 0 Not present
 - 1 Present
- c. Chelsea Clinton — Picture of Chelsea Clinton.
 - 0 Not present
 - 1 Present
- d. Tim Kaine — Picture of the Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Tim Kaine.
 - 0 Not present
 - 1 Present
- e. Barack Obama — Picture of former Democratic president Barack Obama.
 - 0 Not present
 - 1 Present
- f. Michelle Obama — Picture of former First Lady Michelle Obama.
 - 0 Not present
 - 1 Present
- g. Donald Trump — Picture of the Republican candidate for president, Donald Trump.
 - 0 Not present
 - 1 Present
- h. People — Picture featuring people, whether individuals or larger groups.
 - 0 Not present
 - 1 Present
- i. Politicians — Picture featuring politicians other than the candidate and running-mate.

0 Not present

1 Present

j. Celebrities — Picture featuring celebrities.

0 Not present

1 Present

k. Map — For example, maps of the campaign trail.

0 Not present

1 Present

l. Promotion — Promotions from the Clinton store.

0 Not present

1 Present

m. Policy — Statements, statistics, facts or information on policy issues.

0 Not present

1 Present

n. Event — Information about campaign events.

0 Not present

1 Present

o. Quote — Quotes either made explicitly in quotation marks or without but appearing to be spoken by an individual person.

0 Not present

1 Present

p. Prompting to share — Prompting the reader to share the message.

0 Not present

1 Present

12. Video content — If the post contains a video, then please indicate whether the following people and/or things are present or not present in the post. To do so, examine the video thoroughly and determine whether each of the following people and/or things are used. The definitions for each person and/or thing are below.

a. Hillary Clinton — Appearance by Hillary Clinton.

0 Not present

1 Present

b. Bill Clinton — Appearance by Bill Clinton.

0 Not present

1 Present

c. Chelsea Clinton — Appearance by Chelsea Clinton.

0 Not present

1 Present

d. Tim Kaine — Appearance by the Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Tim Kaine.

0 Not present

1 Present

e. Barack Obama — Appearance by former Democratic president Barack Obama.

0 Not present

1 Present

f. Michelle Obama — Appearance by former First Lady Michelle Obama.

0 Not present

1 Present

g. Donald Trump — Appearance by the Republican candidate for president, Donald Trump.

0 Not present

1 Present

h. People — Video featuring people, whether individuals or larger groups.

0 Not present

1 Present

i. Politicians — Video featuring politicians other than the candidate and running-mate.

0 Not present

1 Present

j. Celebrities — Video featuring celebrities.

0 Not present

1 Present

k. Map — For example, maps of the campaign trail.

0 Not present

1 Present

l. Promotion — Promotions from the Clinton store.

0 Not present

1 Present

m. Policy — Statements, statistics, facts or information on policy issues.

0 Not present

1 Present

n. Event — Information about campaign events.

0 Not present

1 Present

- o. Quote — Quotes either made explicitly in quotation marks or without but appearing to be spoken by an individual person.

0 Not present

1 Present

- p. Prompting to share — Prompting the reader to share the message.

0 Not present

1 Present