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Abstract

Nowadays, nation states put much more focus on boosting their soft power, culture and ideologies, in order to strengthen and enhance national reputation and fame. Place branding strategies therefore become a necessity. Meanwhile the emergence of social media has brought changes to our lives in many aspects; it is by no means just a platform but very multi-functional and this research is especially interested in its role in place branding. Instead of discussing power struggle behind place branding, this research chooses a different route: to compare place branding practices between official and non-official branding organizations in Copenhagen on Facebook on one hand and Facebook fans’ consumption and perception in relation to the concept of participatory culture on the other. This is a case study comprising both quantitative (content analysis and survey) and qualitative (online ethnography) research methods. The findings imply that the interactive and connective features of Facebook make it easier to achieve different branding goals. Two branding organizations share both similarities and differences in terms of the choice content, narratives and motives behind branding practices. This study suggests that the notion of place branding should be taken in a more open-minded way in view of the fact that there are many place branding sites, which do not act on behalf of the state but their values. Standard views of place branding sites tend to be political-neutral and friendly to neighbors might not always apply. In terms of audiences’ participation, Facebook could be in favor of the existence of participatory culture yet such degree of freedom relies on administrative decisions and Facebook itself. Fans loyalty and usage also differ between these two fan communities. Fan engagement is by all means an important part of the branding process, especially on social media channel. The research finally stresses the importance of studying place branding with different angles and perspective so as to explore the undiscovered sides of this notion.
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1.1 Background

The Second World War ended 70 years ago, however it seems that wars between nations did not stop. Despite different types of wars, what might be overlooked is the everyday battle between countries in culture, ideology and world power. Due to advancement of technology, closer transnational economic cooperation and changes in foreign policies, mobility of people is increased; experience of travelling and going abroad is thus no longer rare. Nation states now enter the era of endless competition indicated by the variety of world ranking and index. There is a need to increase the value of soft power referring to cultural capital, heritage and ideologies (Aysu, 2013). In this manner, a city operates as capital. In order to facilitate and make good use of the city, place branding strategies are applied. Through branding processes different meanings are added, negotiated and attached to a city, intervening people’s perception and consumption of a city. The concept of place branding is still ambiguous since research and opinions come from manifold academic disciplines and this case study would like to contribute to the ongoing scholarly debate.

On the other hand, ever since the invention of social media platforms like Facebook, Twitter and YouTube around 10 years ago, our consumption of media has changed drastically. Compared to traditional media, social media is said to have altered the process of communications: from one-way to two-way (Sevin, 2013). Audiences are given more power in speaking on behalf of themselves. The rise of social media brought changes to branding practices as well, and city branding is no exception of course. Experience of a city is spread from real-life to Internet or the other way round. This research focuses on two issues: how is a city branded on social media and how does the audience respond with reference to the concept of participatory culture which describes the flow of content across different platforms and consumer’s power to contribute (Jenkins, 2006).
1.2 Aim and research questions

Indeed, place branding has triggered many scholars’ interest, ranging widely from the fields of sociology, political science, marketing, urban planning and many more. However, the majority of studies focus only on official branding organizations, i.e. branding units established or supported by the state. The private, non-official or non-profit ones are often neglected. Responding to this gap, this case study will examine and compare two branding organizations in Copenhagen, the official organization VisitCopenhagen (also known as WonderfulCopenhagen) and a non-official one, 2GOCopenhagen in the hopes of providing a better overview of how city branding practices operate, explore more possibilities by going behind the frame and find out how they might differ due to the fundamental divergence in organizations’ nature.

As social media has now become a main focus of branding organizations apart from the official website, it is fruitful to look at what these organizations do on the platform, which is Facebook in this particular case since it is the most used and far-reaching platform for both organizations. Besides, Facebook easily allows audience participation and interactions. Fans of these two organizations could be tourists, potential traveller, locals and expats living in Copenhagen. Both organizations mostly write in English to make sure that everyone can understand. There are two focuses of this research, which are first how Copenhagen is presented and second how these two fan communities react and if it is coherent with the notion of participatory culture. All research questions and related sub-questions raised will include comparisons between the two organizations:

1) How is Copenhagen presented on two organizations’ Facebook page?
   • What images are conveyed?
   • And how do the organization make use of Facebook to reach branding goals?
2) How do these two fan communities, Facebook users who “liked” the page, consume content and interact on both pages?

3) To what extent do fans engagement and activities form a coherent “participatory culture”?

2. Theoretical background

The research aims to find out how the organizations brand Copenhagen on Facebook and how does the audience, Facebook users, interact on this platform. In the following section, several main concepts that play central roles in this research will be explained in detail, which are branding, place branding and participatory culture. Past researches about place branding focused much more on branding than reception. In fact, audience engagement and participation has become part of branding or at least altered branding decisions. This case study focuses on both activities of branding organizations and Facebook users in the hopes of showcasing such relationship and raising the importance to discuss place branding in this way.

2.1 Branding

Indeed, the concept of branding is highly relevant for media and communication studies. A brand is a name, sign, term, symbol or a mixture of all of them, which aims to identify the goods, or services provided and differentiate it from other competitors (Keller, 2013). Therefore, in media and communication studies’ perspective, branding is a process of message delivery, negotiation and representation of identity with the aid symbols and signs.

2.1.1 Traditional branding

Branding has existed for a few centuries to differentiate goods or services. The first step in
creating a brand is to choose name, logo, symbol and package designs that are distinctive, known as the brand elements (Keller, 2013). Compared to a concrete product, a brand can be more symbolic, emotional and intangible. Branding is a communication means between business and customers: business delivers the brand identity to customers, which are the way they would like to be viewed, what customers actually perceive is brand image. Surely, the divergence between brand identity and brand image may emerge. The pyramid below illustrates how does branding operate (Keller 2013: 108):

![Brand Resonance Pyramid](image)

As demonstrated in the pyramid, four elements play central in branding, which are: identity, meaning, response and relationship. Traditionally, from business or entrepreneur’s perspective, identity and meaning are manageable since they could take initiative in constructing a solid brand identity by considering the expectations of different stakeholders like investors, managerial staff and board members, etc. and discussion among employees and on the other hand, they are in charge of what performance they could deliver. However, it is not that easy when it comes to knowing how audience or customer judge and feel about the brand and how to maintain, enhance customers’ loyalty and build a strong connection with them. The rise of social media makes it easier for businesses to reach this goal. This research
follows the brand resonance pyramid. It studies the identity of branding organizations, meaning added to Copenhagen; then observe response from audience and connection built between audience and the branders.

2.1.2 Branding with social media

Social media is recognized as the next media for marketing and branding (Yan, 2011). The triumph of Obama’s election campaign and the expansion of “Oprah effect” on Twitter reflect the potential power of social media in terms of catching attention, reaching people and delivering messages. Branding online has the same goal as traditional branding: to differentiate the brand among competitors and communicate with audience. CEOs from the companies could now step back from the frontline in answering feedback forms; the online platform gives leaders a chance to present to audience with their idea, philosophy and concept (Yan, 2011). Users on the other hand are said to be in charge of content in branding process. The ecology of online environment is that content is not generated and published by one person; instead, the product is a collective work from different users who modify and contribute continuously (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). The interesting thing commonly observed nowadays is that audiences or followers unconsciously take part in branding process. Even though they have no clear intention to alter branding process, their comments, feedbacks and recommendation are taken into consideration and become an important factor or even a guide for the whole branding process.

Social media lessens the difficulty in getting responses from and building relationship with customers as mentioned above to a certain extent. In fact, raising customers’ engagement and building B2C (Business to consumer) relationship online becomes the core of branding strategies on social media (Yan, 2011). Social media carries 9 goals in branding process: 1) build a sense of membership with the organization, 2) encourage communication of brand values, 3) encourage audience to engage, 4) help organization find its competitiveness, 5) inform ideas behind the brand and build differentiation, 6) check if the brand is properly understood, 7) build positive brand associations, 8) build quality and 9) build greater
awareness of the brand to unreached audience (Yan, 2011). Social media can be a promising tool for constructing and facilitating brand building. Another reason branding on social media is appealing to companies is that the cost is rather low compared to how much a proper promotional campaign might cost. Companies with low budget have a chance to tell a motivating story to capture hearts of audience therefore social media appears to be an affordable gateway to success.

2.1.3 Place branding

Place branding emerged since countries feel the need to differentiate themselves from others in order to gain international exposure and maybe, economic benefits. By definition, place branding uses strategies to manage soft power. The notion of soft power first emerged in political science, which refers to the ability to attract by culture, ideologies and political ideals of a location (Nye, 2004). Politics is a particularly tricky element since it might easily trigger negative effect, which will be discussed further with the case of Denmark’s Muhammad cartoon crisis and Copenhagen shooting later.

Place branding involves more than slogans and old-fashion advertisement in order to deal with abstract elements like culture and ideologies and manages the image of a certain location (van Ham, 2008). It is generally understood as marketing, branding, promoting and regeneration of a particular place (Lucarelli & Brorström, 2013). Some scholars argue that place branding is a type of intellectual property, which is a bundle of emotions, imagination and articulation coming to mind when exposed to signs representing the product (van Ham, 2008). In other words, place branding aims to create some certain images, positive ones, which people would come up with when they think about that specific place. Despite these definitions, the term place branding could be still confusing so some scholars suggests that one way of making a clear definition of place branding is to draw a boundary between place branding and place marketing (Lucarelli & Brorström, 2013).

Place marketing approach stresses techniques and processes in promoting, selling and
distributing the city as product or service whereas branding rests on a symbolic portrayal of information aiming to create associations and expectation of it (Lucarelli & Brorström, 2013). Branding is a production process focusing on ways to produce, create and manage a brand; branding concerns audience reaction in terms of reception, usage and consumption behavior of the brand (Lucarelli & Brorström, 2013). Admittedly, place branding and place marketing are not equivalent and yet should not be viewed as exclusive either. Marketing is inevitably and indeed integrated in place branding process. For instance, marketing strategies like contacting business, doing offline promotion campaigns to drive traffic and generating visibility and noise on Facebook can be easily observed. Thus, place marketing is viewed as part of place branding in this case study. Place marketing and branding are indeed indispensable to a large extent.

Place branding, according to past researches, needs support from different parties to be successful (Ooi & Pedersen, 2010). The negotiation process could be bureaucratic and tedious since searching for a balance between different parties including tourism board, businessmen association, government and citizens is by all means an onerous task. Place management itself is a giant project, which requires local support, collaboration between public, private and engagement with audience all over the world. Cities are branded to sell more products, attract investments, draw more talented workers; drag tourists, frame location, differentiate the city in the global place-product market and shape people’s experience of the location (Ooi & Pedersen, 2010). Therefore theoretically, city brand is not expected to communicate a complete, but intended to project a positive image in audience’ minds. This phenomenon naturally applies to official city branding organizations since they represent state’s expectation, however non-official organizations do not be face such constrains by nature or at least are not bound by these assignments at the same extent. Therefore the notion of place branding might need to be revised when it comes to non-official organizations.
2.1.4 Place branding research’s angle

The concept of place branding is ambiguous since research and opinions come from manifold academic disciplines. The research domain of place branding can be divided into six perspectives which are: 1) critical structuralist perspective, 2) critical humanist perspective, 3) production perspective, 4) co-production perspective, 5) consumer-oriented perspective and 6) appropriation perspective (Lucarelli & Brorström, 2013). The first two perspectives problematize place branding, seeing it as a socio-cultural or socio-political phenomenon focusing on the position of capitalistic system, power relation and neoliberal discourse behind the scene (Lucarelli & Brorström, 2013). The rest do not recognize place branding as a problematic discourse therefore much more focus is put on norms and mechanism that mediate place branding. These perspectives explore possibilities and meanings rather than unfolding power and structural issues.

The research questions of this thesis concern both the organization perspective and the audience perspective aiming to explore more possibilities of city branding organizations’ operation but not to indulge in urban planning, authorities and power relations of branding practices in Copenhagen. This research raises a hypothesis that there are potential differences between official and non-official branding organizations in terms of content shared and audience reception. The aim is to explain and understand what is actually happening in place practices. Co-production and appropriation perspectives will thus be most relevant as this research is a case study, aiming to explore and explain a contemporary social phenomenon with a mixture of methods (Yin, 2003). The former sees reasons, motives and practice of place branding as relational and such process is a continuous one. The latter conceptualizes place branding as inter-subjective social phenomena where different agents involve in production, i.e. “the way different actors make sense of the different manifestation of place branding”. This approach “conceptualizes the phenomenon of place branding as highly dynamic and relational” (Lucarelli & Brorström, 2013: 75). Literature and previous research about place branding mostly adopt objective approach where there are not many studies
studying reception, usage and consumption of different branding policies (Lucarelli & Brorström, 2013). This research has two focuses, one is to investigate what meanings are conveyed and how the nature of organization could justify such practices; another is to explore potential difference in audience reception from these two branding organizations, to understand consumption pattern by investigating how audiences take part and interact on Facebook. Combining co-production and appropriation approaches will possibly allow a more dynamic and open-minded discussion. The assumption here is that place branding activities are not just a product from governmentality, but are conceived, created and expressed by many parties, audience included. Apart from the practice itself, it is also important to study reason and consumption pattern on the other hand.

2.2 Soft power and branding

The concept of soft power was first introduced by Nye in the 1980s, it is defined as the ability to attract and co-opt instead of payment, forcing and other forms of persuasion (Nye, 2004). Soft power rests in 3 aspects: culture, political values and policies (Nye, 2004). Place branding is held responsible for managing and promoting these aspects of a location to the rest of the world. A country would like to be admired and desired, i.e. to be the role model of other nations by boosting soft power. Even though this case study did not intend to discuss place branding with politics much but to a certain extent, politics and place branding are indistinguishable, “place branding is part of a wider spectrum of postmodern power, soft power and public diplomacy” (van Ham, 2008: 126). Political events are said to bring negative effect to place branding and it actually happened to Denmark 10 years ago.

In September 2005, Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten published an article entitled “Muhammeds ansigt”, translated as the Face of Muhammad in English showing cartoons of Muhammad with a bomb as headgear. The Muslim community in Denmark was enraged, 11 ambassadors from Muslim countries demanded a meeting with Danish Prime Minister to take the issues into a serious conversation (van Ham, 2008). They took the incident as an ongoing
smearing campaign in Danish society and press against Muslim and Islamic culture. Danish embassies in Islamic countries were attacked and set on fire. The crisis was aggravated after the US Secretary of State Rice accused Iran and Syria of organizing anti-Danish and Western protests. Resentment from Muslims did not stop, Danish flags were burned and Danish goods were boycotted as well. By September 2006, Danish trade to the Middle East fell by half; the economic lost was estimated at 134 million euro (van Ham, 2008).

The incident came as a surprise to Danish people and government that it tarnished Denmark’s image as a liberal, open and tolerant country. The Prime Minister called this cartoon crisis “Denmark’s worst international relations incident since the Second World War” (van Ham, 2008:144). Denmark’s reputation and national image was sharply weakened in 2006, the image of Denmark as a country, which is “democratic and strongly oriented towards human rights”, suffered severely. Neighboring countries like Norway and Sweden were put in the “same Scandinavian basket by Muslims around the world” (van Ham, 2008:144). The Muhammad cartoon incident indeed brought a devastating damage to Denmark and other Nordic countries. Ever since then the Danish government became more conscious of the vulnerability of image and frailty of branding, realizing politics could potentially put efforts in place branding in vain. An opposition between place branding and politics seems to be presented by this crisis, and relationship with neighbors should be taken with extra care. Therefore looking into how Copenhagen shooting was handled could possibly unravel the allegedly adverse relationship between political incident and the construction of a positive image.

2.3 Participatory culture

Convergence culture (Jenkins, 2006) describes the spread of content over different platforms and how technological devices become multi-functional. Jenkins raised the example of Harry Potter to illustrate its omnipresence in products, blogs, and amateur fictions, etc. Harry Potter is not confined only to its original appearance, the novel. Convergence opens possibilities for
participation where companies offer content across different platforms on one hand and consumers respond by choosing which media to use resulting in a new possibility of communication (Jenkins, 2006). The fan fictions, parodies, amateur videos of Harry Potter created by fans and ordinary people can be found everywhere. Convergence culture indicates the empowerment of fans, “a moment when fans are central to how culture operates” (Jenkins, 2006:1).

As argued before, the rise of social media, Facebook in this case has blurred the difference between users and producers, which led to changes in fan culture. Users are also producers, known as “produser” (Bird, 2011). Thus Jenkins (2006) argues that the ambiguity between user and producer led to the erasure of fans stereotypes. Loyalty of fandom is debatable since being a “fan” on Facebook is common and easy in convergence culture (Gray et al, 2007). Stereotypical interpretation of fandom like generalization of fans being irrational having a miserable life, chasing idol’s car, is doubtful when it comes to online fandom. Fans in the virtual community might no longer match “other” stereotypes of fans. It has become a usual practice of city branding organizations to be more participatory and interactive with audience; encouraging them to engage and communicate more actively (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009). Even though city is not a concrete product, with the aid of social media platform, such participatory culture could possibly exist in this context. Content is flowing among various platforms, and so as the experience of city in this case. The raised question is how the features of participatory culture could apply to “fans” engagement and interaction on Facebook page of an intangible product, Copenhagen.

2.3.1 Online fandom

This research concerns fan communities on Facebook and within the era of participatory culture, fans are more than a group of enthusiastic consumers who actually play a significant role. The web 2.0 environment has changed people’s everyday life in many aspects, notably the consumption of media is changed in the way that audience is invited to participate in the
production process (Gross, 2009). Instead of passively receiving the brand image and product consumers, consumers have now become produser, a hybrid identity of producer and user. Jenkins mentions that fans are now very central in the operation of culture hence they are given more power in contributing to the product and intervening branding process with the emergence of web 2.0 environment (Jenkins, 2006). “Produser” also represents the collaborative and continuous building and extending of existing content in pursuit of further improvement (Bruns, 2006: 2).

The rise of convergence culture said to be favorable for shifting the role of audience and producer (Bird, 2011). Jenkins recognize fandom part of participatory culture where the web 2.0 environment makes it easy for people to become a fan. Being a fan is a common activity where many people might have engaged in. Fans are thus not a minor or marginalized group in society anymore in this participatory culture as everyone is entitled an opportunity to take part in production process and distribution of a product (Jenkins, 2006). Fans no longer fit the stereotypical description of “other” and the traditional notion of fandom where fans are recognized as a group of irrational people with social inadequacy hence needs to be reviewed (Gray, et al, 2007). In the era of convergence culture, fans are a group of active participants who are generating content and shaping the relationship between them and the brand.

In this case study where fan communities on two organizations’ Facebook page are the focus, there is a need to understand what does being a fan mean. From 2010, Facebook renamed “fan” to “like” (Janssen 2010). Facebook differentiates between “organic likes” and “paid likes”, the latter means likes occurred within one day of viewing the advertisement of the page or 28 days after clicking the advertisement. Such statistics is only available for the page admins. Fans in this case study refer to the users who like the Facebook pages with the potential of making contribution to the branding organizations.
3 Case study background

This section will justify and explain why Copenhagen, the capital of Denmark is chosen for the research by looking into information about the city, Danish’s government expectation, and two branding organizations (official and non-official) which will be compared.

3.1 Copenhagen

Copenhagen is the capital of Denmark with the population of 1.8 million (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009). Copenhagen is beyond comparison with other big cities in Denmark like Aarhus, Odense and Aalborg since Copenhagen plays a key strategic role in tourism and international competitiveness which hosts up to 75% of international conventions in Denmark (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009). The other cities mentioned above are basically unknown to internationals so the promotion of Denmark falls on Copenhagen. Copenhagen is indeed a small capital without large labor market and wide mass compared to the other capitals (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009). Therefore the Danish government realized around 1990s that more efforts and inventiveness is needed to make Copenhagen visible (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009). Copenhagen is now the headquarter and main research lab for many companies. Additionally, Denmark introduced Green Card program back in 2008 (The Local Denmark, 2014), a special working permit for highly talented or qualified non-EU citizens. The Danish government believed that they would make good contributions to Denmark so to attract these internationals to stay in Denmark is of utmost importance in branding decisions. Copenhagen, with a myriad of start-up companies, appears to be a hub of opportunities for them. Danish society is often imagined as and associated with openness, liberty and tolerance (Ooi & Pedersen, 2010). It is not easy to please everyone in the execution of branding strategies. One example is that a video clip “Danish mother seeking” which was supposed to be a tourism promotional video for Denmark. The story is about a young Danish woman Karen trying the
find the foreign father of her baby after one-night stand. In contrast to the original idea of the video: portraying Denmark as an open-minded country where citizens enjoy a high degree of freedom, the video triggered anger and discontent among Danish citizens. They were upset since Danish women were portrayed as loose sluts in the video. In the end, the clip was removed and Chief Executive of VisitDenmark, the official tourism authority for Denmark resigned to please the public and put an end to the turmoil (Ooi & Pedersen, 2010). Apparently, disapproving reaction from the locals was not expected but it was so powerful that it could put a halt to the whole ongoing promotion campaign.

3.2 VisitCopenhagen

The Danish government realized the big need of an agency to mobilize public and private interest, to coordinate and promote the city more efficiently (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009). Since Copenhagen is the only metropolis, the official branding organization specializing in Copenhagen Wonderful Copenhagen, also known as VisiCcopenhagen was thus established in 1989 with the aims of creating awareness of Copenhagen as a potential tool in enhancing Denmark’s competitiveness as a whole. VisitCopenhagen is an agent to mobilize both public and private interests to achieve a better coordination for initiatives, and to improve promotion of the city (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009). The organization promotes Copenhagen to tourists on one hand and works closely with Copenhagen Capacity, an agency that attracts investments in Copenhagen. The city is to be presented as a pleasant, exciting and trendy place to live (Ooil & Pedersen, 2010). The role of the organization is to create awareness of Copenhagen as it brings potential benefits for the whole country’s competitiveness and to prepare Denmark to compete in the world market (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009) Visitcopenhagen would like to present Copenhagen as part of lifestyle formation and lived identity where people in the world would wish to become Copenhageners (Jørgensen & Munar, 2009). The official website of VisitCopenhagen is available in 5 languages including English (by default), Swedish, Danish, German and Simplified Chinese indicating that Danes, Swedes, people from German-speaking and Chinese-speaking countries are promising markets.
VisitCopenhagen is active on various social media platforms including Twitter, Instagram, Google Plus and Facebook. All content on social media is in English. Currently, the number of “fans” (people who clicked “like” on the page) on VisitCopenhagen’s Facebook page is massive, accounted for 70462 as at 14th March 2015 with a steady growth.

3.3 2GOCopenhagen

When speaking about place branding or city branding, most researchers only focus on the official branding organization, which is often the biggest, the most far-reaching one and most importantly, set up by governmental departments. The concept of city branding originates from the need to maximize profit a city can bring to the country. Therefore city branding often represents what the nation or the government wants to promote and present. Therefore, the practice could be viewed as a projection of ideal image from the state. However, when a branding organization is made differently, objectives, practices and result of a non-official organization might be totally different as well. Therefore looking into non-official organizations might provide an answer of how place branding could differ.

A non-official branding organization named 2GOCopenhagen is chosen for the research. The organization is a start-up company with limited budget and staff. It was designed by Guy Sønderberg who lived in 8 different countries who understands how difficult it might be for expats to integrate into the local community. To bridge the gap, he set up 2GOCopenhagen, to facilitate integration and enhance the city for visitors and international inhabitants. It aims to provide information and encourage internationals to participate in events happening around them. The organization was founded in 2011 but started to be fully functioning from 2013. The official website is in English and categorized into “event”, “article”, “offers” and “guide”. However it was shut down for maintenance from January to April 2015. The organization is active on Twitter, Instagram, Google plus and Facebook. Staff consists of internationals who mostly work on part-time, voluntary and internship basis. Topics that might be considered sensitive like pride parade, LGBT events are actually often mentioned on Facebook and the
official website. Guide about gay bars and articles about pride parade were found on the website.

4 Methodology and materials

This research is a case study, which is in short focusing on a contemporary phenomenon within real-life context (Yin, 2003). Case study is highly capable in dealing with different forms of evidence, or primary sources like documents, observations and interviews, etc. Generally case studies rely on multiples sources and methods and often gain benefits from prior research. Case study comprises an all-encompassing method, which is “not either a data collection tactic or merely a design feature alone but a comprehensive research strategy” (Yin, 2003: 14). Case study strategy is often mistakenly made equivalent to qualitative research methods; in fact ethnography research does not necessarily produce case study. It could adopt both quantitative and qualitative research methods.

This research has a double focus on a contemporary phenomenon: city branding practices from the branding organizations perspective and participation from the fan community perspective. The third research question raised aims to bring the discussion of fans’ engagement to Jenkin’s theory of participatory culture. Due to the focus and possibly different forms of empirical materials, case study approach is especially relevant for this research. In order to answer the research questions, both quantitative and qualitative methods were applied which are content analysis, online ethnography and survey. The mixture of methods could possibly present more pictures through different angles. My position as an intern at 2GOCopenhagen enabled me to understand more of the internal operation of the organization. 2GOCopenhagen is aware the fact that I am conducting a research related to the company. During the process, I did not encounter any intervention from staff at the managerial level. The internship made me an insider to branding organization to some extent.
4.1 Content Analysis

Content analysis is a systematic, objective and quantitative analysis of messages which could handle a large amount of materials (Neuendorf, 2002). The method relies on scientific method aiming to generate replicable and valid result from data (Rose, 2001). Researchers can thus make a systematic categorization and analysis more easily. The procedure includes sampling, making coding sheet prior to observation, coding content and lastly analyze the result (Neuendorf, 2002). It explains phenomenon avoiding biases of the investigator. Validity, reliability and objectivity are central in content analysis (Neuendorf, 2002). By definition content analysis is a scientific method that is reliable, aiming to generate the same result on repeated trails. The method is generalizable in the way that sample is chosen representatively and randomly. Hypothesis is tested in order to maintain its replicability. Preliminary results from content analysis works as an antecedent, as a base for researchers to develop further analysis and inferences. Content analysis is chosen in this case as I would like to quantify how Copenhagen is presented on these two organizations systematically and this approach could also handle the possible large amount of data.

A coding scheme is made with the aim to see how Copenhagen is represented and portrayed. As originally planned, a two-week observation period was carried out from 1st March to 14th March 2015. All types of posts, i.e. photos, videos or external links posted on two Facebook pages on behalf of the organizations were analyzed with content analysis. The period was a random choice with no expectation of how many and what kind of content would be found; its generalizability could hence lead to a reliable result. As mentioned in theory section, city brand intends to project a positive image therefore topics that might generate negative effects like unemployment, crime and catastrophe are usually avoided (Ooi & Pedersen, 2010). After discussing with the supervisor, it seemed fruitful to look at how branding organizations would respond to the Copenhagen shooting incident, which happened on the 14th of February 2015. Apart from that, it is also worthy to investigate due its utmost importance to different parties including travelers, Danish citizens and other inhabitants in Copenhagen. The same
coding sheet was applied. By the end of the two-week observation period, there were 14 posts from *VisitCopenhagen* and 30 posts from *2GOCopenhagen*. 5 posts were found associated with Copenhagen shooting incident, 1 from from *VisitCopenhagen* and 4 from *2GOCopenhagen*.

4.1.1 The coding scheme

The coding sheet is divided into 4 sections: facts, issue and subject, the way of speaking and connection building. Sub-questions are raised under each section (Appendix 1). The first section focuses on basic facts like type of content, which language is used and the origin of content. The second section pays attention to the content itself like what topic is addressed, and what countries are related.

Internet or social media brings changes to the manner of storytelling in branding process; instead of giving one-way and factual message, organizations should “speak” with the audience where further interactions are encouraged. As a result, the way of speaking appears in more forms. Opinion, stance and tone might be involved. Rhetoric, use of expressive punctuations and use of emotion figures were considered in order to feel the tone and attitude from text. The rise of social media changes the ecology of branding; even though the goal is still pretty much the same as traditional branding: to differentiate the brand among competitors, communicate with audience, to be far-reaching and visible becomes the biggest mission (Yan, 2011). Indeed social media provides a fertile soil for individuals, organizations and companies to build their connection more easily by simply following, adding friends, being a fan, tagging, etc. The last section of the codebook will look into what and how the organizations build their connection on Facebook.

4.2 Netnography

The emergence of Internet created a whole new world, a virtual space, which is now so developed that people can perform a myriad of tasks online which gives rise to different ways of communication and interaction. In this research, fan community is defined as Facebook
users who have “liked” the Facebook page, which is viewed as an electronically facilitated group with common interest, need and curiosity (Ohler, 2010). Traditionally, researchers make use of ethnography to understand human behavior by observing people’s rituals in a particular environment. To understand Internet culture and communities online, a new form of ethnography, known as netnography is introduced to study computer-mediated contingencies (Kozinets, 2010). Netnography is created to study online audience. It is a participant-observant research approach based in online fieldwork whereas computer-mediated communications serve as primary source (Kozinets, 2010). Compared to quantitative methods, qualitative approaches addresses people’s perception and behavior in a more detailed and specific way. Therefore this qualitative method is now widely used in marketing and consumer research so as to understand customers’ perception of the brand or product provided thoroughly. Netnography is highly relevant for this case since it aims to observe and understand online fans communities’ behavior.

The procedure of netnography is quite similar to traditional ethnography. The first step is entrée where researchers should develop a specific research question or social sites that match the topic. Then identify and select a community for investigation. Participant-observation is carried out where the researcher might engage and immerse into the community to collect data ethically. (Kozinets, 2010). The last step is to analyze collected data and present research findings. In order to get a more thorough understanding of online fan community atmosphere and get an ethnographic insight, participation is essential. It might be arguable but important for research to engage in since “removing participative role of ethnographer removes the opportunity to experience cultural understanding” (Kozinets, 2010: 75). Without participation, netnography might make no difference than simply gathering content data. Netnography alone may or may not be adequate to study community. In this case, I was a fan on both pages and took part in some online activities. If the research is about online community and culture, then this method serves as primary approach, but if the focus is community online, i.e. social phenomenon that extends beyond Internet and online interactions, other methods are needed to supplement results from netnography. In this research, survey is adopted to support netnography as the consumption of city is part of
everyday life that goes beyond Internet.

4.2.1 Field observations

In academia, the issue of whether a netnographer should participate in online community is still debatable. However Kozinets points out the importance of participant-observant approach which allows researcher to gain experience and knowledge by his or her own sense of membership. In this research, such participative approach includes being a “fan” on both organizations’ Facebook pages and participates in some random activities including clicking “like” button and commenting on posts casually. I am not a newcomer to these two pages as I have been a “fan” since November 2014. Similar to content analysis, a one-week community observation period was applied from 8th March to 14th March 2015. Observation took place everyday, however the exact observation time depended on when organizations post online. Posting time varied from 16:00 to 20:00 for VisitCopenhagen and 10:00 to 16:00 for 2GOCopenhagen (UTC +1). Due to such difference, observation was carried out 2 times after a post being published with one-hour interval. Sometimes, observation on VisitCopenhagen was done in the next day if the post was made after 19:00. At the same time, I also looked into fans’ wall post to the page.

The second research question raised aims to examine the existence of “participatory culture” in these two virtual fan communities by looking into fans interactions on the pages. Features of participatory culture are operationalized the design of field observation (Appendix 3) focusing on different aspects: 1) General facts: how do the pages look like, what functions are allowed there and the growth of both pages; 2) Participation, interactions and engagement activities among fans and with the organization: what kind of activities were observed, do fans interact with each other, how does the brand and fans interact to each other and what kind of relationship is built between fan community and the organization as Jenkins describes that participatory culture enables interactions between members who share similarities and value their contribution for the others and the emergence of informal mentorship; 3) spread of content: how does content flow and spread further as described in the notion of participatory culture; and 4) authenticity: how real is this virtual fan environment. Due to research ethics
and concern of privacy, names and profile picture of fans are not shown in field notes.

4.3 Survey

The survey serves as a supplement to netnography in order to understand what, why and how fans use these pages. This method is explanatory, descriptive, directional, comparative and contextual in nature. Survey allows researcher “to quantify and interpret rather abstract patterns of culture, serving as a map against which the dynamic character of an individual taste culture of lifestyle may be brought alive” (Schrøder et al, 2003:207). This quantitative method standardizes measurement protocols for comparison; therefore it is high in reliability. Survey has been widely used in audience research since it is capable in dealing with large amount of responses and diverse data in demographic groups. It operates as a tool to compare and contrast among groups, at the same time search for similarities and differences. To compare results from respondents within fan community more easily, SPSS was used to filter and split the data.

4.3.1 Design and distribution

The design of questions focuses on 1) why do people use media; 2) what do they use them for and 3) How do people make sense of the media. This approach “identifies audience groups on the basis of shared lifestyle or social background” (Schrøder et al, 2003: 238). In this research, online Facebook fan community is recognized as a group of people sharing common interest: Copenhagen.

Online surveys about the usage of VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen Facebook pages were created with qualitrics.com which is quite user friendly. Two surveys were created with identical questions; the only difference is the name of organization. In total 19 questions were raised concerning reason for being a fan, motivation and frequency of visit, how do fans engage on the page and why do they do so, fans’ demographic information, how do they evaluate the brand, etc. The number of fans on VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen was 71,782 and 1,452 by the time surveys were sent out, a stratified random sampling was carried
out, as it is unbiased and most representative. Facebook no longer discloses the list of fans of a page to public making it difficult to get information of members. The original idea was to give survey to 500 fans on both pages, however since fan engagement on 2GOCopenhagen was rare; it was thus basically impossible to identify active 500 fans from this page. In the end, with the approval from page admin, finally I was able to send survey to 500 fans both might have been active and inactive on the page. On the other hand since VisitCopenhagen is much bigger in size, it was not difficult to send survey to 500 random fans however they are all active fans who have “liked”, commented or shared posts made by the page. In order to avoid potential trouble, e.g. being reported as spam or be banned from using Facebook in the worst case, I approached fans by sending them a private message with survey link and text indicating that I am a master student; my purpose of research and assuring no personal information will be collected. It was stated clearly that starting the survey means that the user agrees s/he is a fan on the Facebook pages. Even though someone might argue the sample size of 500 fans is small considering there are more than 70,000 fans on VisitCopenhagen, enlarging the sample size might not necessarily increase response rate due to the technical difficulty posted by Facebook. The sample size is representative and enough for this research. Survey for 2GOCopenhagen fans was open from 21st March to 4th April while survey for VisitCopenhagen fans was open from 22nd March to 5th April 2015. In the end, 103 (response rate: 20.6%) and 117 (response rate: 23.4%) responses were received from VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen fans respectively.

4.3.2 Difficulty and other discoveries

It was not easy to reach fans by private message since Facebook usually filtered messages, I saw this note very often: ‘your message will go to “other” folder because you are not connected to him/her on Facebook. Send this message directly to his/her inbox for 8 DKK.’ Message was sent to “Other” folder since I am not connected to the user, i.e. I am not a Facebook “friend” of that person. From experience, users often overlook messages sent to “other” folder; the receiver would not get notification unless s/he was online when I sent the message. Basically, if the receiver does not check message folder carefully, it is highly
possible s/he simply did not see my message at all. The process of sending message to every user was very time-consuming. In addition, Facebook stopped me from time to time by giving a warning message “It seems like you are using this feature in an inappropriate way. Slow down or you will be banned from using this function.” Sometimes completing CAPTCHA, i.e. random numbers and alphabets to verify that messages are not sent by machines or programs, upon request would be fair enough but sometimes I was simply not allowed to send messages for a while.

Throughout the process, I received some replies from fans like “done”, “good luck”. One fan found me too invasive and considered that I was spamming, I got a reply urging me stop stalking and then I was blocked. I received 3 irrelevant “chit-chat” replies that are asking for my personal details like age, nationality, relationship status and possibility to be friend with me on Facebook since “I am filling out your survey right now” or would complete my survey only if I agreed to do so. Researching audience on Facebook might have the flaw that researcher and respondent are not distant enough in some cases where any of the party may feel uncomfortable or privacy being infringed. Interestingly, during the process of sending surveys out, a few fans replied me something like “sorry I do not have anything to do with 2GOCopenhagen”. Therefore, this shows that the decision of like is nothing more than just an easy click on Facebook. This finding will be discussed in detail later.

4.4 Validity, reliability and generalizability

It is essential to address the issue of validity, reliability and generalizability of the research so as to increase its credibility. This research is a case study combining both quantitative (content analysis and survey) and qualitative methods (netnography). Quantitative approach could generate a precise, objective results from statistical data collection while qualitative method could allow researchers to see and understand certain phenomena in depth more humanely. The mixture of methods aims to generate a more reliable and sound outcome. The pilot study done before this master thesis verified that content analysis and netnography are suitable for this research. Based on the pilot study I decided to include online survey to
implement the results from netnography to provide a more complete picture. I chose not to study place branding practices of Copenhagen when it hosted the Eurovision Song Contest in 2014 or major sports event because even though researching on branding practices for special occasion may lead to a distinctive study, it is only one dimension of place branding which occurs during other ordinary days as well and the consumption of a city is arguably part of everyday life.

The first limitation of the research is that the official website of 2GOCopenhagen was under maintenance for approximately 3 months, from mid-January till early April. Even though the research focuses on content and fans interaction on Facebook only, the fact that the organization was running without its website might have possibly altered the results. Specifically, 2GOCopenhagen might use its own sources only on Facebook instead of external links and fans could be more active on Facebook if the website was functioning. Therefore this unforeseen circumstance admittedly weakened the credibility of this research to a certain extent. In addition, due to the fact that only active fans of VisitCopenhagen conducted the survey result generated might not be representative enough to understand “fan” community since those invisible fans on Facebook page were simply ignored. The technical difficulty posted by Facebook in reaching fans through private messages led to a rather low response rate, which might have also weakened the validity of results. Yet all in all, using content analysis, netnography and survey in the research was very helpful in generating a reliable and valid result.
5. Results

Content analysis was first conducted to understand how the organizations present Copenhagen. Afterwards netnography was carried out as a step to observe and explore fans community pattern and behavior. Lastly surveys were given out to 500 fans on each page as a supplement to netnography in the hopes of getting a better overview of fans’ usage of the page and motivations of such engagement behind the scenes. Different branding goals to be achieved by social media suggested by Yan (2011) are evaluated as well.

5.1 Content Analysis: what is presented?

During the two-week observation period, there were in total 14 posts from VisitCopenhagen and 30 posts from 2GOCopenhagen. 5 posts were related to the Copenhagen shooting, 1 from VisitCopenhagen and 4 from 2GOCopenhagen. Appendix 2A shows the full analysis of 44 posts. The general results will be described part by part as follows.

5.1.1 Facts

Facebook enables individuals to share a wide variety of content including: photo, link, video or status (pure text). Photos were found most frequently from both organizations’ Facebook page, weighing 36% and 53% of all content. No “status” (text) was posted as anticipated since pure text is not eye-catching enough to make users pause and read. Organizations can hardly deliver messages to the readers without any visual aids. The origin of source varies, percentage of original content is not high for both pages; we might hence argue that VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen rely on 3rd party’s content heavily. All posts were written in English, however some vocabularies in Danish and other languages like French, Swedish and Chinese were also embedded to the main text on 2GOCopenhagen. Using English as the main language can be understood as a way to reach everyone who might or might not understand Danish, the delegation of other languages might have two opposite
outcomes: 1) People who are not proficient in that specific language might feel alienated and simply do not understand or 2) Adding dynamic and exotic elements to the text. As the official spokesman of Copenhagen, *VisitCopenhagen* writes in English only to stay fair and equal to all audience despite the potential positive effects of writing in other languages. For instance, Danish word “hygge” is regarded as an untranslatable word; this word is similar to “cozy” and sometimes symbolically equal to Danish lifestyle. *2GOcopenhagen* does not bear of a big liability as *VisitCopenhagen* does therefore could freely add these spices to the text when it is appropriate.

5.1.2 Issue and subject

*VisitCopenhagen* mainly focuses on daily life and guide; the latter is a very clever strategy, which could cover almost all topics listed in the coding sheet. There were several types of travel guide like 5 things to do in the next 2 weeks and 12 hours in Copenhagen addressing individual’s difference in budget, expectations and length of travel plan. Content concerning daily life are usually casual pictures of less symbolic destinations like metro station, street and canals. Similarly, *2GOcopenhagen* also puts much emphasis on daily life like news about living cost and quality in Copenhagen, artistic picture of the city or suggestions of sunbathing spots, etc. Research done on destination branding indicates that netizens started to be overwhelmed by fancy pictures of nightlife. Amateur shots and articles showing real-life experience of locals bring sense of life and authenticity to the virtual world. It also carries a higher degree of accountability where audience could feel more attached and connected (Choi et al, 2007). Alongside with daily life, food-related topics like café, economic restaurants and recipe are often shared on *2GOcopenhagen* as well. High living cost in Copenhagen might indeed be considered as a discouraging factor for tourists however it is an important topic for residents in Copenhagen therefore *2GOcopenhagen* is freer to share this kind of information.

When it came to the question of related countries, it became increasingly obvious that what matters is only Copenhagen for *VisitCopenhagen* since all posts were directly related to the
city. In contrast, only 66% of 2GOCopenhagen’s posts showed direct relation to Copenhagen. For instance, posts about Women’s Day, Pi Day and Black Friday have no specific geographical correlation. News article from The Local Denmark aggressively entitled “Ten ways Copenhagen beats Stockholm” published on the 11th of March was shared by 2GOCopenhagen on the same day. VisitCopenhagen had shared a blog post listing 27 reasons why Copenhagen is worth a visit before. Admittedly, this news article is patriotic and promotional yet might be seen as too boastful and offensive to Stockholm or even Sweden, which is definitely not desired by an official organization representing Copenhagen. Surprisingly, almost half of 2GOCopenhagen’s content did not show any specific destination while street and dining places appear very often on VisitCopenhagen. It is clear that VisitCopenhagen only aims to promote Copenhagen where other Occasions, that yield no association with Copenhagen are ignored. 2GOCopenhagen shares more similarities with amateur bloggers writing what is going on with surroundings, what is interesting and what happens today. VisitCopenhagen cares about “us”: Copenhagen while “other” is implicit and not indicated; alternatively for 2GOCopenhagen, “us” can be extended to a worldwide context where Copenhagen becomes trivial, “others”: the potential competitors with Copenhagen are present as well.

5.1.3 The way of speaking

This section concerns tone, manner and attitude. Unlike speech, text lacks life since there is no pause, stress and volume. This section of the code sheets attempts to decode the way of speaking by investigating rhetoric, the use of expressive punctuations, e.g. “!”,”…” and emotion figures: construction of facial expression by symbols like “:)” or visual symbol generated by Emojis, an application widely used on smartphones and tablets.

The results of content analysis imply that call for action is the most common rhetoric for both organizations accounting for 64% on VisitCopenhagen and 50% on 2GOCopenhagen. Promote 3rd party comes second on the list. What is worth attention is that 2GOCopenhagen shows more diversity in rhetoric, which is unfound on VisitCopenhagen. 2GOCopenhagen
sometimes speaks in a humorous tone like: “You will have to wait another 100 years to see Pi Day falls on 3/14/15” on 14\textsuperscript{th} March post A and wish “Happy Friday” on 13\textsuperscript{th} March post A. \textit{VisitCopenhagen} promotes their Instagram account three times among 14 posts whereas the caption was very straightforward like “Follow our official Instagram” on 10\textsuperscript{th} March. The punctuation use is very different between two organizations. 79\% of \textit{VisitCopenhagen}’s posts did not contain any expressive punctuation; only full stop and comma were found most of the time. On the contrary, \textit{2GOCopenhagen} used exclamation mark and question mark very often. The same goes for emotion figure, 83\% of posts from \textit{2GOCopenhagen} contained smiley or winky faces while \textit{VisitCopenhagen} did not use any figures at all. \textit{VisitCopenhagen} comparatively projects a serious, formal and staid narrative while \textit{2GOCopenhagen} presents fans with a more interactive, dynamic and vivid attitude.

\textbf{5.1.4 Connection building}

Being a successful page on Facebook is all about network reaching: raising your visibility by engaging with other parties. Not surprisingly, most content on both pages bring potential direct economic benefit to private businesses like restaurants, café and festivals, weighing 71\% for \textit{VisitCopenhagen} and 60\% for \textit{2GOCopenhagen}. Meanwhile, \textit{2GOCopenhagen} shows slightly higher percentage in which no one gains any direct economical benefits, usually when the posts are about recipe and some special days.

Hashtag, a type of metadata tag is increasingly used on various social media platforms; users can insert hashtag on search bar to see relevant posts. \textit{VisitCopenhagen} and \textit{2GOCopenhagen} are complete opposite to each other when it comes to hashtag usage. All posts from \textit{2GOCopenhagen} contained hashtag and vice versa. \textit{2GOCopenhagen} generally used two to three hashtag and for sure one hashtag of itself: #2GOCopenhagen. The use of hashtag is a way to catch users attention and draw them in to the post. However, Facebook does not seem to be hashtag friendly since it is not possible to just enter hashtag on the search bar. Users can only click on hashtag and see other relevant posts. Therefore hashtag cannot fully function on Facebook, which might be the reason why \textit{VisitCopenhagen} totally abandoned hashtag.
strategy on Facebook although organization does use hashtag on Twitter and Instagram. All posts from VisitCopenhagen built connection to the others. Hyperlink was found in 6 of the posts drawing users to other Facebook page; the other 8 posts drive traffic to other social media platform including Instagram, YouTube as well as external websites like Telegraph, Guardian and VisitCopenhagen’s official website. 60% of 2GOCopenhagen’s were connected to other Facebook page with hyperlink. 5 posts from 2GOCopenhagen actually do not make further connection. However the statement that 2GOCopenhagen relies heavily on external sites is flawed to a large extent since the official site was under maintenance during the entire observation period.

5.1.5 The Copenhagen shooting

The Copenhagen shooting happened between 14th and 15th February 2015 (Saturday and Sunday), Denmark Prime Minister Helle Thorning-Schmidt visited Jewish synagogue on 15th February morning where a Danish citizen of Jewish descent was killed. The national flag was flown at half-mast and other forms of memorial events were held on 16th February.

On 16th February, 2GOCopenhagen uploaded a picture showing the city hall with the national flag flying at half-mast. Later in the day, 2GOCopenhagen shared details of the memorial event to be held in the evening at Krudttønden, the cafe where the first shooting happened. Next day, 2GOCopenhagen posted a picture showing footage of the memorial gathering and flowers piled in front of the Jewish synagogue. VisitCopenhagen posted a picture of the synagogue covered with flowers on the same day. In this incident, 2GOCopenhagen kept users updated and informed about things happening around Copenhagen, posts regarding to half-mast flag and memorial event were instant information. The picture of memorial gathering posted by 2GOCopenhagen is arguably quite political since a banner with French sentence “Je suis Danois”, translated as “I am Danish” is clearly shown. The Charlie Hebdo shooting happened in Paris in January aroused worldwide condemnation towards terrorism and a soaring determination for preserving democracy and press freedom. The French phrase “Je suis Charlie”, I am Charlie in English was used both nationally and internationally as a
way to support France after the tragedy. Similarity Danish expression “Jeg er Dansk”, meaning I am Dane was prevalent on the media after Copenhagen shooting. “Je suis Danois” connected these two incidents, representing support from French people and indicating a strong, solid stance against terrorism and protecting freedom of speech. This picture and other content posted by 2GOCopenhagen showed the organization’s grief towards victims, strong stance in preserving democracy and speech freedom. A much more mild and objective language is observed from VisitCopenhagen with text “People pay their respects at the synagogue in Krystelgade. Our thoughts go out to everyone affected by the shooting in Copenhagen this weekend.”

Referring to the results from content analysis, the rhetoric of both organizations was mostly to describe what happened and grieve for the victims. No expressive punctuations or emotion figure were found from the posts due to the incident’s solemnity. Except a post giving details of memorial event at Krudttønden, the rest were photos expressing sadness and tribute to victims. The wish to build connection to other platform does not hold anymore in such situation given the seriousness of the incident. 2GOCopenhagen continued with its habit of using hashtag of its own and this time cphshooting, a hashtag that is used all across social media regarding to this tragic incident.

Admittedly, high crime, danger and catastrophe are discouraging factors for tourism and branding in general, terrorist incident is of course no exception. The case of Jyllands-Posten publishing cartoon showing Muhammad wearing a bomb as headgear provoked hatred among Muslim countries against Denmark, blemished Denmark’s and even other Scandinavian countries’ goodwill and reputation (van Ham, 2008). It was a painful lesson for Denmark therefore Danish government might try to eliminate political matters from place branding terrain as much as possible since then. It is hard to tell if VisitCopenhagen, as an official authority promoting Copenhagen tried to avoid mentioning the incident given the fact that it was on national and international headline. In other words there is no way that potential visitors did not know about that. In light of the wide dissemination of the Copenhagen shooting incident, the best the organization could do was to respond to the incident but not
much as a way to dilute potential adverse effects. *VisitCopenhagen* carries the mission of projecting good sides of Copenhagen. The organization was put in a difficult position with not much flexibility since the organization often needs to negotiate and collaborate with different stakeholders behind, including the citizens. *2GO Copenhagen* on the other hand, did not bear such responsibility therefore were not affected by strict rules in giving opinions. Showing a small degree of similarity to local news organizations in Copenhagen like *Copenhagen Post* and *The Local Denmark*, *2GO Copenhagen* provided Facebook fans and other users with instant image, practical information of memorial event and encouraged people in Copenhagen to unite in protecting freedom and democracy.

**5.2 Netnography: fans’ engagement and interaction**

Field notes made during observation focused on aspects including general facts, general fans’ activities, connection building among fans, spread of content and authenticity. In answer to the second focus of the research: how does online fan community engage on the page and how do these activities form a participatory culture, results from netnography are guided by Jenkin’s argument of how a fan culture is considered as a form of participatory culture. The guiding criteria are: “1. relatively low barriers to artistic expression and civic engagement; 2. strong support for creating and sharing creations from others; 3. some type of informal mentorship whereby what is known by the most experienced is passed along to novices, 4. members who believe that their contributions matter and 5. members who feel some degree of social connection with one another (at the least, they care what other people think about what they have created)” (Jenkins, 2009: 6). Jenkins also clarified that not all members must contribute, but it is important that they should feel free to do so and believe that what they do will be valued.

**5.2.1 Barrier to expression and engagement**

Facebook was inspired by high school address book, which contains graduates’ pictures and contact. High school students sometimes call this book Face Book. Ever since its launch in
2004, Facebook has gone through many changes in terms of layout, policies, settings and functions. Admittedly, Facebook nowadays gives a chance for different organizations, enterprises and businesses to create a platform for expressing themselves and engaging with partners, clients and other potential customers. However, the design and structure of Facebook changes so much that the degree of freedom given for such activities cannot be guaranteed but will differ from time to time. VisitCopenhagen Facebook page allows wall post, which could be pure text, photo, video or link however Facebook users cannot write on 2GOCopenhagen’s wall. On both pages, fans can “like”, comment to posts made by the page and comments under the post.

Even though fans can freely write on VisitCopenhagen’s page, the design of Facebook page makes them hardly noticeable. Wall posts by fans to the Facebook page are all placed at the left bottom part of the page under “Posts to Page”. Therefore fans’ posts are not as noticeable as posts made by the page itself. In case of 2GOCopenhagen, the door to free creation is simply shut since fans cannot write on the page’s wall. A representative from 2GOCopenhagen explained that they wanted to avoid inappropriate content and to minimize extra workload for admins. Fans on this page could share their creation only by commenting or sending private message to the page. Surely it is very restrictive since page admin has full control of what to share with fans. Fans’ contribution is restricted in two ways: 1) setting by the page admin where wall posts could be disallowed and 2) even if wall posts are allowed, Facebook’s default design makes them difficult to be seen.

Engagement on others and pages’ post is allowed and could be done by putting “like” and commenting. On VisitCopenhagen, fans do “like” other people’s comment; on average 2 to 4 likes are recorded. Replying to someone’s comment is quite rare, it usually occurred when the comment is a question, i.e. asking for opinion or seeking advice. As mentioned above, wall posts are hardly noticeable therefore engagement on wall posts are even more unusual. 2GOCopenhagen has a much smaller fan community where comments to posts do not appear very often. However comments did receive “like” from the other members, on average 1 to 2. Such interactions are normally not interrupted unless some users in the community report to
the page admin as inappropriate or spam. Alternatively, page admin might delete comments that are vulgar, sexist, racist, disrespectful or threatening as indicated on VisitCopenhagen “About” section.

**5.2.2 Support and appreciation from others**

The overall observation on VisitCopenhagen page is that comments under the page are very positive with no signs of hatred and disrespectful discussions. The community environment is rather peaceful and supportive of Copenhagen. Fans often like others’ comment; personal touching stories and photos captured more attention and appreciation. Sometimes if the post shows a specific destination like museum, park or castles, some fans respond to the post with their own picture of the same place. Normally this type of relatively unique content captures more likes than the rest; fans seem “generous” in giving likes to other fans’ posts is a way to appreciate and support the effort behind. Wall posts generally received much less attention, not even from the page itself. “Irrelevant” comment or posts including promotion of pages, businesses and services did not get any feedback from other fans, however this type of content was not removed, just seemingly ignored. 2GOcopenhagen’s fans receive support and appreciation differently than those on VisitCopenhagen, as indicated above comments were comparatively rare and the same goes for interactions among fans. Sometimes, fans like other people’s comment. What is more interesting is that maybe due to the small size of community, the page engaged more with its fans. 2GOcopenhagen often liked fans’ comment and replied to them directly. Therefore, instead of others, fans on 2GOcopenhagen receive more support and appreciation from the page itself. We might argue that 2GOcopenhagen is a more sincere and loyal fan of its followers than the opposite.

**5.2.3 Existence of mentorship**

Previously, theoretical background states that branding on social media has blurred the line between provider or brand and customer or fans. Therefore the same will be applied to the concept of mentorship. The term “mentorship” might sound very hierarchical; it is hereby interpreted as the process of passing on information from one to other where the role of
“experienced” and “novice” is not constrained to a particular party. 3 types of “mentorship” were observed, from page to fans, from fans to page and lastly from fans to fans.

The first type of mentorship fits the traditional or even stereotypical imagination of brand being the “experienced” and fans being the “novice”. As an official representative of Copenhagen, *VisitCopenhagen* bears the responsibility to introduce the city to its audience who might or might not know Copenhagen well. The organization wishes to bring knowledge, give suggestions and hope people enjoy Copenhagen. Therefore when fans receive the information from the page and reply, “let’s do it!” such content seems to be taken as an advice from the mentor to a novice who needs some guidance and assistance.

However the identity of “mentor” and “novice” is not constant, i.e. the brand is not always the mentor and fans are not necessarily novice. Another form of mentorship is from fans to page as observed on 2GOCopenhagen’s post of Palæo’s food. A fan left personal feedback and gave extra information, which would allow the page to know more about quality of the place. Unlike *VisitCopenhagen*, 2GOCopenhagen is not positioned as “expert” or “spokesman” of Copenhagen but just a group of enthusiastic expats who is not superior to fans. It becomes easier to cultivate mentorship from fans to brand. The last form of mentorship is from fans to fans; it appeared as a form of advice seeking or suggestion. Specifically, when a fan asked “has anyone been to the Copenhagen Zoo…?” and someone answered, “Yes, it’s pretty good”. The answer serves as evaluation of the zoo by a fan who was there, who is more experienced. Mentorship exists in 3 different ways on these two virtual fan communities.

5.2.4 Self-awareness

There is a strong desire to contribute and to be heard by the others among some members from fan communities. It can be validated by some fans’ wall post to *VisitCopenhagen* with the hopes of being noticed. For example, a post contained a link directed to an article entitled “Top things to do in Copenhagen”. This is not just a form of self-advertising, it showed that firstly that fan believed that this article is of interest of *VisitCopenhagen* and fellow fans
therefore the article is worth attention and sharing. In other words, the author believed their contribution matter for other fans. Secondly, the author cared about what the others think about of their work therefore the post was made actually more than once to get more attention. However since fans cannot post on 2GOCopenhagen, it is not easy to foresee if fans would freely present themselves and how they would do so.

It is very common to see fans “like”, comment on post made by the page and others. In addition, behavior of tagging friends and asking for opinion on comment was very usual too. 2GOCopenhagen’s post dated 11th March about how Copenhagen beats Stockholm actually appeared to be a poll, asking fans to vote for Stockholm or Copenhagen. A fan replied “Go Copenhagen Go!”, and another person asked for more opinion by tagging some friends. Although there was no real discussions between these fans how exactly Copenhagen wins or if Stockholm is actually better. The act of participating and “voting” under the post might imply that fans think that supporting their favorite city is important. As mentioned by some scholars, posting on social media is a way of self-expression, self-fetishism, self-display or even affirming identity by attracting attention to feel important and existence (Miller, 2010)

5.2.5 Notes about fans authenticity and engagement

During the netnographic observation and process of sending out surveys, the third method used in this research, the question of authenticity becomes increasingly important. Throughout one-week observation, fans who liked, commented and shared posts were randomly inspected. Due to individual’s privacy setting on Facebook, access to their personal information was very restricted. Most of the comments under posts look genuine and come from real-life experience. Both fan communities show passion, amazement and love towards Copenhagen and even Denmark.

However, it came to my notice that some of the accounts that liked VisitCopenhagen’s posts look unreal. There were accounts with no personal picture, no cover photo, and no posts at all.
It was not possible to “be friend” with or send “message” to the user either. The seemingly active participation on VisitCopenhagen, i.e. the high number of likes on posts, is to a certain extent doubtful as well. When going through the full list of fans who liked the post, some accounts appeared on the same list twice or even three times. Therefore the number of likes does not actually match the number of account on the list. However, I could not confirm if it was some special tricks done by the page itself, or simply technical error on Facebook. What can be sure is that authenticity of some data collected by observations, in terms of number of likes and users’ profile is questionable.

5.3 Survey: fans’ motives and brand evaluation

Surveys were given out to 500 fans on both Facebook pages. In the end, there were 103 and 117 responses from VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen respectively. Survey questions and brief report are attached in Appendix 4 and 5 respectively.

5.3.1 VisitCopenhagen

All recipients of the survey are active fans on VisitCopenhagen who have engaged explicitly on the page. Participants aged between 16-60 years old while 72% of them are female. Generally, they are quite active on Facebook with 73% of them using the site daily. Chatting with Facebook friends and reading news are most common activities. Demographic information indicated that 58% of respondents reside in Copenhagen while 15% are Danes, 85% are expats who are mainly studying or working in Copenhagen. By completing the survey, user agrees and is aware that s/he is a fan on the Facebook page as clearly indicated in the private message they receive. The reasons why they became a fan vary, voluntary search on Facebook ranks first and friends’ activities appearing on newsfeed comes second (picture 1b). The first reason is more conscious and active behavior while the second reason seems to be rather passive.
Table 1. Motives for liking VisitCopenhagen page

Seeing interesting content and gaining knowledge about Copenhagen or Denmark are main functions of the page for fans. Most of them do not visit the page regularly, almost half of the fans visit the page when posts appear on newsfeed and 34% of them visit the page when they would like to check information. All recipients of the survey are active fans who take part in different forms of engagement of the page; link/photo/hashtag click is the most common engagement and “like” is the second one. Showing appreciation or agreement is the main reason for engagement. When it came to the question of brand evaluation, most people agree that VisitCopenhagen promotes Copenhagen which is designed for non-locals. 23% of fans actually visited places or participated in certain events after seeing relevant post on the page. VisitCopenhagen are used mainly for leisure and informative purposes, note that 10% of respondents use the page for academic or occupational purposes. Lastly, fans understand VisitCopenhagen as a page that brand and promote Copenhagen targeted as non-locals.
### 5.3.2 2GO Copenhagen

2GO Copenhagen’s fans who received the survey are both active and inactive on the page. Fans are comparatively younger, ranging from 16 to 50 while the 67% fans belonged to 21-30 group. Results also indicate female are more active at 68%. Not surprisingly, the majority of them use Facebook daily. Same as Visit Copenhagen fans, chatting with friends and reading news are at top of all activities. 81% of respondents actually live in Copenhagen and 98% of which are not Danes. Almost half of the Copenhagen inhabitants are students.

Similar to results from Visit Copenhagen, Facebook friends activities on 2GO Copenhagen appearing on newsfeed is the main reason that made the user become a fan, weighing at 46%. The second reason is voluntary search on Facebook. 68% of fans do not visit the page regularly, they do so when posts appear on newsfeed or when they want to check information. 12% of fans only visited the page once when they became a fan. 45% of fans who revisited the page did not do that with their own initiative, it happened when posts appear on newsfeed. As observed by netnography, not many fans actively engage on the page, it is supported by survey results. The most common engagement types are like and link/photo/hashtag clicks while mean value indicates that comment, share content on Facebook page or to specific group is really rare, the value is situated between “seldom and” “never”. 68% of fans engaged on the page as a way to show agreement or appreciation. Most fans could identify 2GO Copenhagen’s goal in guiding Copenhagen experience and promote the city. Indeed as clarified on 2GO Copenhagen page, “2GO Copenhagen.com is an online platform that is designed to facilitate integration and enhance the city life for inhabitants and visitors.” However it seems like the purpose of facilitating integration is not widely recognized. The prevalence of similar branding organizations might dim such purpose. Promoting Copenhagen and guiding experience in the city are rather obvious motives that fans could easily observe.
How much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/ No opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2GO is designed for non-locals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GO page is an open and participatory platform</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GO promotes Copenhagen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GO guides Copenhagen experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GO makes it easier for non-locals to integrate to Danish culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GO caters audience’s need and preferences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. 2GO Copenhagen fans’ brand evaluation

Remarkably, 47% of fans actually followed guidance or suggestions on the page in real life. 87% of them admit that the page has provided some new information for them, which could fit one of the main functions of the page: learn about Copenhagen or Denmark (44%). That might explain why 12% of respondent engage on the page as a way to save information so that it will be easier for them to go visit the place or participate in the event shared on the page. Not very different from previous results, 2GO Copenhagen fans’ decision of being a fan is even a more mediated and guided action. Since recipients are both active and non-active fans on the page, it was not surprising to see a much lower mean value (1 being never, 5
being almost each time on the frequency scale) when it came to engagement pattern. 
2GOCopenhagen is also entertaining and educational for most of the fans especially when
87% of them gained new knowledge from the page.

5.3.3 Inhabitants vs non-inhabitants

In order to draw a comparative analysis between different respondents, data from the survey
was exported to SPSS. I evaluated such results on few aspects: motive of being a fan, usage
of the page, brand evaluation and brand loyalty

5.3.3i Motivation of being a fan

The results generated by SPSS suggest that the Copenhagener’s decision of being a fan is less
guided. 40.4% (2GOCopenhagen) and of fans who live in Copenhagen “liked” the page
because friends activities appearing on their newsfeed. Furthermore, 34.9%
(2GOCopenhagen) and 53.5% (VisitCopenhagen) of fans living in Copenhagen became a fan
as a result of voluntary search on social media or search engine. The percentage for fans who
do not live in Copenhagen is much lower for 2GOCopenhagen and slightly lower in the case
of VisitCopenhagen.

Surprisingly, 68% of 2GOCopenhagen fans who live outside Copenhagen “liked” the page
as they saw friends’ engagement with the page on their newsfeed. Only 18.2%
(2GOCopenhagen) and 50% (VisitCopenhagen) who are not living in Copenhagen
respectively became a fan because of voluntary search. Alternatively, results from
2GOCopenhagen are very contrasting but still make sense as the organization is not very
well-known to tourists. Tables below show fans’ motivations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What made you “like” 2GO Copenhagen page? (%)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends’ activities (like/comment/share) on the page appear on newsfeed</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From “suggested post”</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw from other social media platform (e.g. Twitter, google plus, Instagram)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary search on Facebook</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary search on search engine (e.g. Google, Yahoo, Duckduckgo)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=95)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. Motives for liking 2GO Copenhagen page (inhabitants in Copenhagen)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What made you “like” 2GO Copenhagen page? (%)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends’ activities (like/comment/share) on the page appear on newsfeed</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From “suggested post”</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw from other social media platform (e.g. Twitter, google plus, Instagram)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary search on Facebook</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary search on search engine (e.g. Google, Yahoo, Duckduckgo)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=22)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Motives for liking 2GO Copenhagen page (non-inhabitants in Copenhagen)*
5.3.3ii Usage of Facebook page

The general results from the surveys indicate that entertainment/leisure and know about Copenhagen/Denmark are the main functions for fans. After splitting cases on SPSS, I could observe some patterns in fans’ usage of branding pages. Question number 3 asks fans to choose up to two main functions of the page, the table below illustrates how do fans use the page. Note that since respondents are allowed to choose up to 2 options, the sum under each category is not 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2GO (CPH)</th>
<th>2GO (Non-inhab)</th>
<th>VCPH (CPH)</th>
<th>VCPH (Non-inhab)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/leisure</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get knowledge about CPH</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates of events</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See pictures/videos</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/occupational use</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5. Fan’s usage of the page*

*2GO= 2GOCopenhagen, VCPH= VisitCopenhagen*

CPH=inhabitants in Copenhagen, Non-inhab= non-inhabitants

Not surprisingly, branding pages appear to be more educational and informative for inhabitants. Both pages often share news or articles that talk about Danish lifestyle, culture, social systems in Denmark and living standard, which are possibly big interest of inhabitants. Copenhagen is the hub of opportunities, conferences and events. Therefore we may say that there are many things going on in the city however it might be sometimes difficult to get hold of information about concerts, festivals and conferences without a proxy. Both
2GOCopenhagen and VisitCopenhagen try to provide fans with comprehensive information about specific event in which naturally inhabitants care about more. There are many non-official sites similar to VisitCopenhagen. Staff working in these sites might treat VisitCopenhagen as a central information agency and at the same time a role model to learn from and get inspired. There were past researches about place branding of Copenhagen so it is not surprising if there are researchers currently studying the sites. Non-inhabitants who do not need so much instant information and “tutorial” about Copenhagen mostly just consume the page for leisure.

5.3.3iii Brand evaluation

Question number 10 in the survey comprises 6 statements about brand identity of the organizations and ask respondent how much they agree. The table below shows mean value of each statement, calculated by 5 different levels of agreement raging from strong disagree (1) to strong agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>2GO (CPH)</th>
<th>2GO (Non-inhab)</th>
<th>VCPH (CPH)</th>
<th>VCPH (Non-inhab)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed for non-locals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and participatory</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Copenhagen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Copenhagen experience</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-locals integrate into Danish culture</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cater audiences’ preferences</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6. Fans’ brand evaluation*
Inhabitants slightly agree more that the page is designed for non-locals, such difference is not that big since both pages are writing in English. Unlike non-inhabitants fans who live in Copenhagen might have more opportunities to share, follow suggestions and even actually participate in events or visit featured places. This could explain why mean value for the statement “the organization guides Copenhagen experience” is higher among inhabitants. Lastly, since demographic information of both surveys indicates that most respondents are not from Denmark, understanding more about Danish culture might be interesting for them. Again, residents in Copenhagen tend to agree more that the branding organizations make it easier for non-locals to integrate as the organizations could have addressed FAQs about everyday life issues posted by many internationals accommodation, registrations, transportations and tax.

5.3.3iv Brand page loyalty

One of the biggest challenges faced by enterprises nowadays is to keep customers loyal to the brand. The concept of loyalty raised here could be very puzzling; it could be loyalty towards the brand page or to Copenhagen (indicated by behavior of following other pages related to Copenhagen). To stay simple for now I would hereby define it as loyalty to the branding page itself. The results generated by SPSS show that non-inhabitants are actually more loyal compared to residents in Copenhagen. 71.2% (2GOCopenhagen) and 48.8% (VisitCopenhagen) of fans who live in Copenhagen are at the same time fan of other pages related to Denmark or Copenhagen. It is understandable that one page cannot provide all information a person needs. Therefore fans who live in Copenhagen who are probably more curious and in need of information about Copenhagen become a “fan” of other pages as well. Tables below show fans loyalty to the branding pages.
Apart from 2GOCopenhagen/VisitCopenhagen, are you a fan of other pages related to Copenhagen/Denmark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2GO</th>
<th>VCPH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (n=95)</td>
<td>100% (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7. Fans’ loyalty to the page (inhabitants)*

Apart from 2GOCopenhagen/VisitCopenhagen, are you a fan of other pages related to Copenhagen/Denmark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2GO</th>
<th>VCPH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (n=22)</td>
<td>100% (n=43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8. Fans’ loyalty to the page (non-inhabitants)*

Fans who do not live in Copenhagen are less likely to be “fan” of similar pages. The results from 2GOCopenhagen is especially contrasting, it could be due to the fact that 2GOCopenhagen is much less known to new-comers so its fans might have “liked” other pages before. VisitCopenhagen comes as the first few results on the search engine when inserting keywords like “Copenhagen tips”, “Copenhagen information”, etc. The whole mechanism of how SEO (search engine optimization) operates, search engines index data and rank websites in results is a very complicated yet determinant factor.
6. Further discussion

In this section, primary results will be discussed in detail in relation to the research questions raised: 1) how is Copenhagen presented, 2) how do organizations use Facebook to achieve branding goals, and 3) how do fan communities consume content and interact on the pages, and how fans engagement and activities form a coherent ‘participatory culture’.

6.1 How is Copenhagen presented and branded?

One of the assumptions of this research is that there are differences between official and non-official branding organizations due to fundamental divergence in their structure, aim and nature. Drawing comparison between how VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen present Copenhagen will possibly unveil such differences.

6.1.1 Similarity: Copenhagen is lovely

Both VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen projected a big enthusiasm towards Copenhagen as expected. The difference in structure, nature and departure point among these pages in the end generates a similar image: Copenhagen is a nice place for all including locals, expats and tourists. The good sides of Copenhagen are heavily highlighted.

VisitCopenhagen strikes a balance to visualize a pleasant experience with Copenhagen of both “Copenhageners” and “visitors”. VisitCopenhagen shows a wide variety of content that could fit different needs. The rather casual photos showing street, metro station and bikers in the city are more or less a projection of everyday life in Copenhagen. It depicts a picture of ordinary fortune, an everyday life that might be desirable for many. At the same time, the organization shows fine and luxurious dining places that are often operate as symbol of classy lifestyle, gimmick of “Michelin” or “5-star” ranking might easily draw tourists’ attention who are more willing to spend during holidays to maximize “quality time”.
Concerts and exhibition represent the vibrancy and modern character of the city and would probably be very interesting for music lovers. Free activities and unique cultural symbol like Superkilen could be appealing to inhabitants and visitors who would like to experience Copenhagen differently. Guides like “12 hours in Copenhagen” gives advice to tourists directly. Basically content shared on the page is very broad covering many different aspects of the city rendering the city is a lovely place for all.

Even though 2GOCopenhagen is much more active on Facebook, with 30 posts during two-week observation period, its point of departure as a group of expats in Copenhagen led to a relatively consistent depiction. Copenhagen is presented as an ideal place for living. Ongoing events like “SMK Friday”, “Danish Sunday”, article of best spots to read under the sun, rankings about Copenhagen in expats “quality-life” are more of inhabitants’ interest. As clearly indicated in “about us” section on Facebook page and the official website, 2GOCopenhagen’s main goal is to facilitate integration in Copenhagen. No expensive restaurants and hotels are featured; a rather ordinary, simple lifestyle of Copenhageners is presented. Topics that are not specific for Copenhagen like black Friday, Women’s Day and Pi Day were found quite often. This is an easy way to build connection to all audience who might or might not reside in Copenhagen. Overall, content shared on the page is not that much interesting for tourists who would like to get practical guide of where to stay, what to do in the city with a limited time. Copenhagen is more portrayed as a nice place for living.

6.1.2 Difference: branding

The departure point of the research was that both VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen brands Copenhagen. Admittedly, this hypothesis holds in the case of VisitCopenhagen whose aim is to promote Copenhagen to everybody. Selling the lifestyle of “Copenhageners” as the biggest feature of the city. Unlike Stockholm, which is named as “The Capital of Scandinavia” on VisitStockholm or other authorities’ websites in Sweden, where Copenhagen should be situated has always been a struggle. Therefore the main mission of VisitCopenhagnen is to make a clear brand image of Copenhagen, modern and edgy architecture, bikers-friendly
environment and cozy small capital are what Copenhagen can identify itself from the other Scandinavian metropolitans. Instead of fighting with Stockholm for Viking histories or Helsinki as a ski destination, VisitCopenhagen catches these ordinary features, consolidate and further transfer them to a unique synonym of Copenhagen. VisitCopenhagen is a storyteller, creating a clear and strong image of what Copenhagen is. VisitCopenhagen’s brand value is equivalent to Copenhagen image and value.

2GOCopenhagen on the other hand brands Copenhagen as a top-quality life expat city where “hygge” is nothing more than a usual lifestyle among Danes. However branding Copenhagen is not the only mission or not even its main goal, 2GOCopenhagen also brands itself heavily. Later on, it became increasingly obvious that 2GOCopenhagen puts much emphasis on “who we are”, “what can we do for you”, providing information about Copenhagen with their own perspective, preferences and lens as a young, fun, international team. 2GOCopenhagen identifies itself as a guide, a trust-worthy and reliable party that expats, locals and tourists can get information from. Posting content like women’s day and making tea with flowers which are totally independent of the city, 2GOCopenhagen actually brands itself as a group of people who also care about social issues, about readers’ health. Brand image and most importantly, personality comes out from the choice of content and narrative. 2GOCopenhagen uses a much more informal, humorous and friendly tone to talk with audience. What seems more essential for the organization is to project a character, to differentiate the organization from other “competitors” like Scandinavia Standard, AOK and the Melting Pot. The organization aims to be a bridge between non-locals in Copenhagen and Danish culture but not just to brand the city and try to be the most solid and trusted bridge with its own personality over the other organizations. Branding could be a matter of degree; 2GOCopenhagen showcases a hybrid form of branding: beautiful Copenhagen, Denmark and the organization itself. The cover photo on Facebook showing hashtag of LGBT represents 2GOCopenhagen’s position within alternative culture.
6.1.3 Limitation: responsibility as information provider

As shortly discussed above, branding organizations are not enough in providing adequate information for inhabitants or visitors. Although both organizations often share news, it is clear that those news are not so much serious or political. Serious topics about education system, welfare, property prices, etc. are not covered. Arguably, VisitCopenhagen mainly focuses on tourists therefore local topics about Denmark and Copenhagen are not of interest of its target audience. 2GOCopenhagen is comparatively freer to share rather “discouraging” yet interesting topics like high living cost, stereotypes about Danes and boastful fetishism of Copenhagen which VisitCopenhagen and basically other official branding sites usually avoid. This finding might question an assumption or argument that often appears in scholarly discussion: branding organizations do not raise negative topics. In the case of non-official branding sites that do not bear responsibility of being governmental and official, this constrain does not necessarily apply.

2GOCopenhagen describes itself as: “2GOCopenhagen.com is an online platform that is designed to facilitate integration and enhance the Copenhagen experience for International Students, Expats, Tourists, and Locals alike”. “Our mission is to be the number one go-to place for International students, Expats and Travelers in Copenhagen. We give you the insights and the same perks as locals, through our all-English website”. I would hereby argue that the organization is not able to “give insights and the same perks as locals” as it wishes when important topics that locals care about are missing. Going back to the example of the Copenhagen shooting incident, both organizations react quite late. Even though 2GOCopenhagen provided fans with footage of what was going on in the city and details of the memorial event after 2 days of the incident, it failed to give fans the an overview of what happened. On VisitCopenhagen page, the amount of information related to the incident is even less. There was no clear description of what exactly happened and how. Both pages assumed that fans know what happened already, or did not want to dig too deep into the issue as they are not news. Therefore, both pages did not provide adequate information for the sake
of their fans who might be locals, expats and tourists in Copenhagen since this incident was of utmost importance for each group.

6.1.4 Positive brand association

VisitCopenhagen mainly brands Copenhagen while 2GOCopenhagen brands Copenhagen and the organization itself. No matter what the branding object really is, Facebook is a useful tool to establish a positive brand association, according to the survey results brand image of two pages is quite positive. Creating an environment to engage with the audience directly is the best thing offered by Facebook or other forms of social media. Even though the fan base of VisitCopenhagen is big so it might be very time-consuming for the page admin to reply to every fan. However as far as I observed before, page admin sometimes answers wall post asking for advice and tips in Copenhagen to get closer and connected with fans. Even though VisitCopenhagen does not inject any personality or character to its own brand identity, the position of being “official” and “spokesperson” of Copenhagen is further consolidated through “about” where VisitCopenhagen describes themselves as “the official convention, event and tourism organization of Copenhagen”. As described before, although the number of likes is very misleading it could indeed project an image of the page being widely used, reliable and accurate thus the positive image of the city projected could be more easily accepted.

2GOCopenhagen describes itself as an online energetic and young platform to facilitate Copenhagen experience. Apart from emphasizing on that in “about us”, this brand identity is reinforced through rhetoric and narratives. The current cover photo on Facebook page shows 2GOCopenhagen.com on the happy wall with caption “English Speaking Online Community #Copenhagen #Visitors #Students #Expats #LGBTQ #OneLanguageforAll”. The organization uses Facebook’s characters to project a consistent and positive brand identity. Although 2GOCopenhagen does not allow wall post so the only way to build connection with fans is through comments and private message. 2GOCopenhagen basically replies to each fan comment directly in a polite yet not too formal manner. As Jenkins (2006) mentioned, online
participants care about their creation or at least think that their contributions matter to the others. Showing fans a strong sense of recognition could delight them, encourage them to engage more in the future and most importantly, build a friendly and open-minded brand image. Building a positive brand association one of the missions of social media (Yan, 2011) and both organizations made a good use of Facebook in doing so.

6.1.5 Be visible and easily reachable

Social media builds connection easily. On Facebook, it could be done by simply “tagging”, putting hashtag and inserting hyperlink. From observation, both VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen uses these ways to reach different parities on every post. Building connection to others is vital; posts that could not generate traffic to another site might have no value from the SEO perspective. Therefore mentioning other Facebook page, directing to external links has basically become a necessity in social media communication strategy. The biggest difference lies in the fact that VisitCopenhagen did not use hashtag at all, even though users cannot search on Facebook with hashtag, there is still possibility that they get to the post by clicking on the same hashtag elsewhere. The use of hashtag is a way to make the post reachable as much as possible. The goal is to be far reaching on Facebook so that more traffic could be generated outside Facebook, and the ultimate aim is to be on top of search engine results. Therefore, such practices could possibly build greater awareness of the brand and to reach more audiences (Yan, 2011).

2GOCopenhagen shows a stronger desire to be seen than VisitCopenhagen. 2GOCopenhagen has a fan base of around 1,400 people, which is obviously far lower than its main competitors. Social media is loaded with information; consider a user who has more than 200 friends and many other “liked” pages. Posts that appear on their newsfeed could lose its top spots in some minutes. Posting frequently could possibly increase the chance that fan sees the post. The results from survey reflect that the reason why many fans became a fan was not due to a very conscious choice; many of them liked the page because they saw friends’ activities on newsfeed. 2GOCopenhagen posted 2 to 3 times a day while VisitCopenhagen posted only
once. Since 2GOCopenhagen so far generates no profit and the organization does not pay Facebook to boost post for now, the only way to be visible is to post more frequently and hope that fans would be active on Facebook at the same time. Alternatively, boosting can make post appear on top of fans’ newsfeed regardless of original posting time.

6.2 Fans consumption and interaction

The second research question focuses on reception level, how does fan community consume the content, i.e. what do they use the page for. And how do they interact and engage with others, and the branding organization on Facebook.

6.2.1 Multi-functional

Facebook was first built as a platform to share pictures, videos and text with friends. Although Facebook is now becoming more multi-functional and has been more than just an entertainment platform for many parties, but its nature of being an entertaining and leisure space still remains. Therefore the results from the survey show that most fans use the page for leisure or entertainment purpose. Seeing interesting picture and videos is another main function for fans. The pages could be also educating and informative since many fans indicated that they got some new knowledge about Copenhagen and Denmark from the page. For those who live in Copenhagen, the pages act as a guide. Half of the fans actually follow the suggestion and participate in featured event. Fans who share information to their friends usually do so since they find the information interesting and useful and would then like to spread that to friends.

From netnographic observation, wall posts on VisitCopenhagen are actually quite rich in variety including: advice seeking, self-promoting and advertising, asking for directions and reviewing of the city. Usually customers write review to restaurant or café’s Facebook page with ranking and detailed description, I was surprised to see similar posts to VisitCopenhagen. It seems like fans make VisitCopenhagen equivalent to Copenhagen, or as a product provider,
therefore visitors like to evaluate the experience as post it to VisitCopenhagen page. Fans also like to express themselves on the page by sharing personal touching stories related to Copenhagen, posting pictures of them in a specific destination. Some fans post videos they made around the city. It seems that fans treat this space as a stage for them to show their creation and talent. Unfortunately since such function is not allowed on 2GOCopenhagen, the page is not more multi-functional than it was designed and it is not the best place for fans to show creativity.

6.2.2 Fans? Friends? Employees?

From observation, there are some die-hard fans on both pages who almost “liked”, “commented” and “shared” all posts on the branding page. Many current and former staff at 2GOCopenhagen are those die-hard fans on the page but I cannot be sure if fans on VisitCopenhagen are really so in love with Copenhagen or the page as a voluntary action or they are employees, contributors or partners with the page. I received one reply from a fan of 2GOCopenhagen telling me that actually he does not use the webpage or participate in the platform, he “liked” the page since he knows the founder so it is a way to show support to his friend. Facebook was first developed for people to stay in touch with their friends in real life. It might be hard to imagine for some people, but many companies nowadays hire specialists to manage social media channels for public relations, communications and marketing purposes. Therefore online engagement might have bigger meaning than it seems. It would not be surprising to see employees, representatives or partners of the organizations engage on the page as a business tactic or build good commercial relationship.

As described before, fans on Facebook sometimes invite their own friends by tagging their name to see the picture or to discuss issues raised by the post. Fans could be friends with each other. Even though Facebook is now developed so much further than when it first started, companies can make their page, people can open groups, the very basic form of communication generated from real life might still exist. Online engagement and interaction is not restrained in the virtual Internet terrain, it can be driven from the offline world or the
other way round. Fans can make friends with the other fans too. I received chitchat private message and friend request from fans whom I sent my survey link to, and those I did not send as well. In fact, I am exposed to fan community since I commented randomly on posts too. Fans rarely interact with other fans however they might be interested to make closer contact and be friends with other people from the community.

6.2.3 Question of loyalty

The results from survey reflect that the choice of being a fan is not a very conscious decision. After filtering the results in SPSS, it shows that fans who reside in Copenhagen are more aware and self-motivated in “liking” the page. However, many fans are not just a fan of their page but other pages related to Copenhagen as well. From the perspective of branding organizations, fans might not be very loyal, or as loyal to the page as they would like fans to be. Nevertheless if we look at this statistic alternatively, the fact that it is 2GOCopenhagen’s and VisitCopenhagen’s mission to promote Copenhagen, so then it can be a good sign when fans are so interested in Copenhagen. VisitCopenhagen actually relies heavily on external sources when it came to article, other sites providing information about Copenhagen are featured. Driving traffic to other sites could broaden those pages’ fan base. Loyalty to Copenhagen and loyalty to the page are indeed in an adverse relationship in this case, and in the case of VisitCopenhagen loyalty to Copenhagen comes with bigger importance.

As discussed earlier, 2 fans from 2GOCopenhagen and 5 fans from VisitCopenhagen replied me that they have nothing to do with the page or simply do not know anything about the page, however since I got their contact by actually going through carefully the list of people who liked, commented or shared the information so what they claim is not true. This phenomenon shows that the decision of “like” is nothing more than just a casual click, which people might easily forget. This phenomenon could support Gray’s (2007) argument that being a fan on Facebook is an ever more common mode of cultural consumption in the era of convergence culture. Clicking “like” on Facebook might even be evolved to a natural, reflexive physical reaction out of consciousness. Our stereotypical or old understanding of fandom where fans
have to submit application form to fan clubs, to show up in activities and pay annual fee that are by all means reminders of their fan identity does not apply anymore on social media. Being a fan, follower of pages take almost no effort and no concrete contributions is required. The behavior of revisiting page is also rather passive than a motivated visit. On Facebook, the only occasion to remind fans of the fact that they are part of the fan community is when they see posts coming up on newsfeed. As a result, fans might easily just forget about the page. In contrast, 2GOCopenhagen acts more like a friend if not a loyal fan to their fans considering that the organization replies every time to an individual fan directly.

6.3 Existence of “participatory culture”?

The last question of this research concerns the existence of “participatory culture” among online fan communities of both pages. Some features of participatory culture as mentioned by Jenkins could be found.

6.3.1 Low level of engagement?

From the term “participatory culture”, people might understand the higher the engagement and participation is, the more valid the statement is. From observation it seems that engagement is very unusual on 2GOCopenhagen. There are not many likes and comment is even more rare. Admittedly, VisitCopenhagen and 2GOCopenhagen are very different in fan base. Actually even though it looks like VisitCopenhagen easily captured more than 300 likes on every post, when calculating the number base on the total number of fans, such percentage is still far from satisfactory, usually lower than 1% at around 0.5%. One thing Jenkins (2009) pointed out clearly is that participatory culture does not mean everyone needs to participate, but they should at least feel that it is free to do. The same goes for this case, low engagement on two pages does not necessarily render participatory culture is not valid at all. Therefore what is important to evaluate is not if engagement is high but how easy it is for people to engagement, participate and interact.
The original design of Facebook is favorable for engagement since people are free to like and leave comment on post, however the more this platform is developed the more restricted it becomes. There are more options in privacy, page admin is empowered to block users and remove comments that are not desired. Compared to other pages where fans of both pages are basically given the greatest degree of freedom. Especially on VisitCopenhagen, Facebook fans could freely post to the page, like, comment and share information. Unlike VisitCopenhagen, 2GOCopenhagen does not allow wall post. Even though allowing wall post would possibly encourage more engagements, this function is not activated, as staff from the organization would like to avoid having inappropriate content like advertisement and spams on the page. Admins can thus manage the page easily since they do not need always need to check if there are any indecent posts. Fans could still freely like and comment on post. Therefore I would argue that both pages are relatively free place for creation, participation and engagement. Some relevant researches done before point out that page admin might remove comments that are not in favor of the page to keep a “clean” and “unanimous” image of the page, I have been taking a close look at these two pages and did not see page admin deleting any comments. Firstly, there were not any vulgar, pornographic and irritating content from fans. Secondly, even though some comments might not be in favor of Copenhagen they were kept. Therefore due to the easiness of participation with basically no entrance restriction, the only thing might be that the person needs to be a Facebook user, Facebook is a fertile soil, which is favorable for participatory culture.

6.3.2 Contribution matters

Starting from the beginning, some scholars recognized Facebook as a stage for people to present, show-off and indulge in self-branding. They use this stage to project an image of themselves, which is the way they want others to see (Miller, 2010). People are conscious of how they appear, what they write on Facebook. The platform itself is a good foundation for the rise of participatory culture (Jenkins, 2009). In this particular case, brand pages are no
exception; both branding organizations uses Facebook as a channel to project the ideal image of Copenhagen, the side they would like fans to know about. Therefore logically they care about matters like how much audience like them, how many responses are received, which kind of posts receives more feedback, etc. On the Facebook page, page admin is entitled to get a lot of information regarding to audience responses. Data like the number of reach tells how many people actually saw the post, details of post engagement show how many people click on the link, click to see the picture; if it is a video statistics of average view duration and how many people watch it till the end, etc. will be available as well. However none of these functions could be found on a personal account, they are only available on pages. Such policy divergence implies that contribution definitely matters, and what matters even more is how much these contributions are accepted and appreciated for people who run a fan page. 2GOCopenhagen is even more “participatory” than its fans as page admin likes and replies to comments individually every time to maintain a nice relationship and make fans feel their effort, feedback or contribution matters and recognized.

Facebook is a form of affiliation where “membership exists in formal or informal way in online communities centered around various forms of media” (Jenkins 2009: xi). Members in the fan community could also engage on the pages by leaving comments and writing on wall and this is a form of contribution taking more time and effort. When going through wallposts on VisitCopenhagen, it was quite common to see travel bloggers sharing their latest blog post about experience in Copenhagen. Their decision of posting on VisitCopenhagen is not a random one, firstly VisitCopenhagen is the biggest fan page about Copenhagen therefore it should be the best choice the author must feel there is some sort of connection between fans of the page and his/her article, in other words the author thinks that there is something in common between his/her interest and fellow fans thus they would probably find the article as the author. The feature of “members believe that their contributions matter feel some degree of social connection with one another” suggested by Jenkins (2009: xi) is valid in this case.
Convergence culture or participatory culture opens up new learning and collaboration (Jenkins, 2006). The emergence of social media blurred the division between “producer” and “user”. As mentioned before, the term “produser” showcase the fuzzy hierarchy in traditional communication model, or the rise of new media has eliminated such hierarchy to a great extent. In this case, it is clear that fans who are supposed to be “users” are not passively receiving message from the producer anymore, they take the initiative, react directly to the content. They demonstrated what it means to jump out from the box by expressing themselves freely. New meaning is then created and spread further to the “producer” and other “user”. Communication is now a two-way, if not more complicated, process of meaning negotiation and construction. Mentorship exists and interestingly is not restrained in a rigid traditional format: from mentor to novice. In fact, no one could be always the mentor; not even the page itself even though it might probably be imagined as the more experienced one in the first place. Branding page gained knowledge from fans as well. Basically the role of “mentor” and “novice” is now taken flexibly by everyone.

Another feature is that this cultural phenomenon offers content across different platforms to gain new markets. Since both pages are not only active on Facebook, content posted on Facebook would appear on different platforms. As illustrated by the results of survey, some fans got to know about the page and became a fan on Facebook from different channels, maybe from results on search engine, hashtags search or other social media platform. From online observation and survey given to fans on both pages, flow of content appears in different way, it could be from virtual to real life: when fans follow suggestions on the page to visit places or participate in events; or from real life to virtual: some fans comment with their personal picture at the featured destination on the page. Arguably, the reason why both organizations are present and active on social media platform is not just a branding strategy, it is also a marketing tactic to open up new market, to reach more users and redirect them to
7 Conclusion

This case study investigates place branding practices in Copenhagen on Facebook and audience reception. The major finding from this research is that the place branding is a very complicated discourse, which is not constant or stable. Place branding process, decisions and outcome are subjected to the state, different stakeholders including local business, citizens, neighbors, and many other factors that might not even be part of the plan.

This case study comparing content on VisitCopenhagen, the official branding organization and 2GOCopenhagen, the non-official one by quantitative content analysis has yielded some intriguing results even though differences in how Copenhagen is presented and audience would interact were expected beforehand. Similarly, both organizations are very supportive of Copenhagen and project a high degree of enthusiasm, love and proudness of the city. 2GOCopenhagen is less limited by expectations and responsibility as an ambassador therefore types of content varied more and a rather informal narrative was observed. VisitCopenhagen showed higher consistency in the choice of content and language. Another difference is the treatment of “sensitive” topics like politics. The Danish government has learned its lesson from Muhammad cartoon crisis in 2005, which is why it seems politics is taken care with a great degree of caution. The comparison of how these two organizations handled the Copenhagen shooting implies politics is a sensitive issue, which could be quite tricky to cope with and can put the organization at a dilemma. Even though politics is not always in favor for the construction of a positive image indicated by the Muhammad cartoon crisis, it is almost impossible to totally exclude politics from place branding process as political incidents might arise with no anticipations.

Studying branding practices from 2GOCopenhagen, a non-official organization also raised the question if the definition of place branding should be extended, especially when it comes
to non-official organizations. It is perhaps important to bear in mind that some place branding organizations might carry more missions apart from promoting and raising awareness of a specific destination. In the case of 2GOCopenhagen, apart from its aim of spreading the enthusiasm towards Copenhagen, the organization is also eager to promote itself and to be connected to its fans. In the case of Copenhagen, there are many branding organizations similar to 2GOCopenhagen like Scandinavia Standard and AOK, which might also serve as main information providers of the city. Therefore there is a need to study non-official organizations as well since official agent, although it is often the most far-reaching one, is not the only site that shape and alter people’s reception and imagination of a specific destination.

There are many researches about place branding policies and its effect on tourism, economy and nation reputation. However I see the phenomenon as an everyday life practice and thus would like to step back to see how people consume and react directly to the information. Meanwhile, there are different media or marketing studies done on branding of commodities so I was interested to investigate on branding practices of intangible entity like a city which we consume everyday. Netnographic observation combined with survey unraveled fan communities’ usage of the pages and motivations behind. Social media is a helpful tool for organizations to achieve branding goals where tasks like connection building, creating brand awareness and keeping interactions with audiences can be done more easily than ever before.

Social media platform is very multi-functional which can be favorable for cultivating an interactive and participatory culture among fan community. However page admins and more importantly Facebook itself are empowered to decide how much freedom is given to audiences so it could change over time. The emergence of social media or Facebook in this case indeed reversed the hierarchical relationship between the brand and customers as the division between producer and user is now becoming unclear. Mentorship passing from the experienced to the novice is no longer restricted to the brander and fans; knowledge is passed from fans to fans, from fans to branders as well. Possibilities and flexibilities are opened up due to the alleviation of such hierarchy. Some fans also utilize the freedom by actively engaging and interacting with the page and showcasing their creative or unique contributions.
The concept of participatory culture is validated to some extent; audiences are allowed to express themselves on the platform where they could get feedback from the others and spread the message further. The act of sharing their own stories, blog post and personal pictures could be seen as an evidence of “members who feel some degree of social connection with one another (at least they care what other people think about what they created)” (Jenkins, 2009: 6). From observation, Copenhagen experience is also circulated from the virtual space to real world or vice versa can be seen as the spread of content over various platforms. The results also support the idea that fans are no longer a marginalized group but a promising party to take part in and intervene the branding process. 2GO Copenhagen particularly demonstrates how fans’ engagement is valued from branders’ perspective; supporting the argument of fans playing a significant role in media industry and how culture operates (Jenkins, 2006). However the field observation and process of giving survey indicates that authenticity of this online fandom culture, both in terms of the credibility of high engagement on Visit Copenhagen and veracity of individual identity, is sometimes questionable.

This case study provides some interesting insights into place branding practices of different organizations, the role of Facebook in branding and virtual fans’ consumption of content. The results could be used as a foundation for further research investigating power and structural relations within the branding organizations, especially non-official ones that might encounter pressure from business partners and advertisers instead of the state. Further research could also focus more on audience like the role that place branding plays for different parties, i.e. the locals, expats and potential tourists; as discussed before politics seem to be a very tricky yet unavoidable element in place branding thus it might be also interesting to investigate place branding in times of political scandal or crisis. Past researches on place branding of Olympic hosting cities are interesting yet it could be done differently for example by comparing place branding practices of the city before, during and after hosting the event. Place branding is certainly a very complex yet compelling topic in academia that could be investigated and explored in many ways and perspectives.
8 Bibliography


Online sources:
2GOCopenhagen official page
www.2gocopenhagen.com

VisitCopenhagen official page
www.visitcopenhagen.com

The Local Denmark (27th June 2014) “Denmark to overhaul green card scheme”
Retrieved:
http://www.thelocal.dk/20140627/denmark-to-overhaul-criticised-green-card-scheme
Appendix 1: Code Sheet

First section: Facts
1. Type of content
   1) Photo
   2) News
   3) Article
   4) Event
   5) Video
   6) Status (pure text)
   7) Other (specify)

2. Language used/shown in content (can choose 2)
   1) English
   2) Danish
   3) Other language (specify)
   4) No text

3. Origin of source
   1) Authentic/Original Content
   2) External source from:
      i) Blogs
      ii) Newspaper/Magazine/Radio/TV
      iii) Local organization
      iv) Foreign organization
      v) Enterprises/businesses
      vi) Individuals
      vii) School
      viii) Other (specify)
Second Section: issue and object

4. Topic
   1) Festival (concert like)
   2) Dining
   3) Politics
   4) Religion
   5) Daily life
   6) Culture/custom/tradition
   7) Night life
   8) Travel guide (i.e. itinerary including different aspects)
   9) Cost of living
   10) Other (specify)

5. Related country
   1) Copenhagen/Denmark
   2) Other country (specify)
   3) Worldwide

6. Destination mentioned/shown
   1) Historical building/heritage (castle)
   2) Cultural events and facilities (museums, art exhibitions, etc.)
   3) Parks and garden (Recreation places)
   4) Shopping places
   5) Facilities and infrastructure (transport, hotel, etc.)
   6) Entertainment (e.g. amusement park)
   7) Nature
   8) Restaurant/cafè/bar
   9) Government Building (City Hall, Parliament, etc.)
   10) Religious place (church, mosque, temple)
   11) Street
   12) Not applicable
Third section: The way of speaking

7. Rhetoric
   1) Self promotion
   2) Promote 3rd party
   3) Wish/greet
   4) Describe
   5) Educate
   6) Compete
   7) Praise (e.g. Copenhagen is the best, etc.)
   8) Grieve
   9) Humor
   10) Call of action

8. Use of expressive punctuations (“,,”“:”“/ “,”?’”’(”’” excluded) on Facebook text
   1) None
   2) “?”
   3) “!”
   4) “…”
   5) Other (specify)

9. Use of emotion figure (دة, etc.)
   1) Yes
   2) No

Fourth section: connection building

10. Potential direct economic benefit
    1) None
    2) Private enterprise/business (specify)
    3) Public sector (specify)

11. Use of hashtag
    1) Yes (specify)
    2) No
12. Use of hyperlink
   1) Yes (specify)
   2) No

13. Connection to other platform
   1) None
   2) Social media
      i) Instagram
      ii) Twitter
      iii) Google Plus
   i) Pinterest
   v) YouTube
   vi) Other Facebook page
   3) External website
      i) Self
      ii) Others’
Appendix 2 List of posts and coding results

Two-week observation: 1\textsuperscript{st} - 14\textsuperscript{th} March 2015

VisitCopenhagen (14 posts)

1 MAR

VisitCopenhagen added 4 new photos to the album: Instagram of the week from Copenhagen — with Edgardo Machura

Follow VisitCopenhagen on Instagram

2 MAR

With springtime officially here, here’s a timelapse that will hopefully capture some of the greener, brighter days to come here in Copenhagen:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AV2ZWX6GC30

The Streets Of Copenhagen - Time Lapse

Music by Chet Faker Facebook: Rasmus Steen Film Edited in Final Cut Pro X. Filmed with Canon 7D and Gopro Hero 3. © Rasmus Steen

YOUTUBE.COM

3 MAR

Every fortnight, one of our co-workers gives you his or her take on what to see and do in Copenhagen in the next 14 days. From a flea market in Nørrebro to bingo sessions at Copenhagen Street Food, these are some of the experiences and events happening in the coming two weeks.

4 MAR

Guide To Copenhagen is back with more local tips to the city! This week’s local tip is Nordisk Bredhus at Nørrebro (literally the Nordic Bread House). The small bakery is full of personality and the most delicious bread you can imagine. This is the perfect place for a good breakfast. Read more: http://link.to/gebhA

Like · Comment · Share · 280 · 5 · 32
5 MAR

*VisitCopenhagen*

March 5 at 4:55pm · 

"A slow burner of a city": Danish crime writer Sissel-Jo Gazan speaks to Guardian Travel about her take on Copenhagen. Read more: [http://link.to/at09M](http://link.to/at09M)

Like · Comment · Share · 187 · 15

---

6 MAR

*VisitCopenhagen*

March 6 at 3:47pm · 

With the weekend closing in, here’s our take on Copenhagen’s top 10 nightclubs, as part of our comprehensive guide to Copenhagen nightlife. Read more: [http://link.to/nightclubs](http://link.to/nightclubs)

Copenhagen by night (photo by Morten Jerichau)

Like · Comment · Share · 292 · 3 · 26

---

7 MAR

*VisitCopenhagen*

March 7 at 5:01pm · 

Next weekend, the acclaimed Sónar Festival will open its doors in Copenhagen for the first time ever, as Sónar Copenhagen takes over DR’s Koncerthuset with names such as Trentemøller, Åme and Jon Hopkins. Also, the concert house is quite an exceptional architectural experience in itself.

More info & tickets at: [http://link.to/sonar](http://link.to/sonar)

Like · Comment · Share · 96 · 4

---

8 MAR

*VisitCopenhagen*

March 8 at 7:53pm · 

Here are some VisitCopenhagen Instagram photos from this week. See the rest of them and follow us on Instagram [http://link.to/usq](http://link.to/usq)

Like · Comment · Share · 812 · 13 · 74
9 MAR

VisitCopenhagen
March 9 at 4:07pm - 😄

From the National Museum to the changing of the guard at the royal palace - VisitCopenhagen has made this short list of tips for free activities and sights in Copenhagen. Read more: http://nk.to/visitegph

The view over Copenhagen (photo by @Thamplng.com)

Like · Comment · Share · 978 14:00

10 MAR

VisitCopenhagen
March 10 at 4:00pm - 😄

One of Copenhagen's iconic green bike messengers caught on-duty on a sunny day in the city. Follow our official Instagram: http://nk.tol/vistinsta

Like · Comment · Share · 641 18:00 46

11 MAR

VisitCopenhagen
March 11 at 4:03pm - 😄

This week's boat tip from Guide To Copenhagen is LOS Café & Bar at Nørrebryg. This place is perfect right now, because they serve great cappuccino and because you can drink your coffee sitting in the sunshine outside. See more: http://nk.to/losst

Like · Comment · Share · 284 3 17

12 MAR

VisitCopenhagen
March 12 at 5:00pm - 😄

Copenhagen's historic Nyhavn waterfront recently made it to Telegraph Travel's list of most colourful places in the world! See what other places made their colourful list here: http://nk.to/nyhavn

The world's most colourful places - Telegraph

Escape the drab British winter with a tour of the most colourful towns and cities around the world

Like · Comment · Share · 1,006 41 135
13 MAR

Visit Copenhagen
March 13 at 5:10pm

From Tivoli to Christiania to the world's best restaurant: 27 reasons why you have to visit Copenhagen right now, courtesy of LovinTrends. Read more at: http://link.to/27reasons

Like · Comment · Share · 761 · 10 · 69

14 MAR

Visit Copenhagen
March 14 at 4:51pm

Are you a foodie, fashion head - or both? Here's a guide to a perfect 12 hours in Copenhagen, made by 12hrs.

12hrs in Copenhagen — 12hrs — Travel Guides for people like you!
Fashion, food, and the happiest people on earth. Welcome to Copenhagen!
LINK.TO

Like · Comment · Share · 369 · 8 · 77
2GOCopenhagen (30 posts)

Note: If there are more than 1 post per day, they are named Date post a/b/c, post a came earliest in the day.

1 MAR

Cinnamon Roll (#Kanelbullar in Danish, #Kanelbulla in Swedish) is perfect for cozy Sunday afternoon! 🍩 Follow the recipe and enjoy! #2GOCopenhagen

Ingredients:
- 500 ml flour
- 20 ml baking powder...

Like · Comment · Share · 11

2 MAR post a

Fun boardgame night at Bastard Café! 🎲 #2GOCopenhagen

Like · Comment · Share · 6

2 MAR post b

You can see bikes everywhere in #Copenhagen, even in the harbour.... #2GOCopenhagen

Like · Comment · Share · 4

3 MAR post b

Bikes in the Harbour: Is yours down there? – Aperture of a city

Man it was a chilly weekend in CPH. So I’m glad I warned my friends from the UK to bring extra clothing before they arrived on Wednesday afternoon. The couple flew...

Like · Comment · Share · 4
3 MAR post b

After living in Denmark for a while, how Danish are you? Take the test right now! 😁 #2GCopenhagen

3 MAR post c

@Denmark is not only the land of fairytale, it has now officially become the wonderland of candy! Please note that chewing gum and chocolate are not included 😊 #2GCopenhagen

4 MAR post a

How Danish Are You? [Quiz] - Pine Tribe

4 MAR post b

Danes among the world’s top candy consumers

Only the Finns have a sweeter tooth... for now

Chokoladefestivalen d. 7. og 8. marts 2015 | chokoladeselskabet.dk

Chokoladefestivalen afholdes igen i år på Carlsberg i TAP 1 Ny Carlsberg Vej 91, 1799 København Y
Lørdag d. 7. og søndag d. 8. marts 2015 kl. 10 til 17 begge dage

Like · Comment · Share · 5 1

Like · Comment · Share · 4

Like · Comment · Share · 11 1
4 MAR post c

5 MAR post a

5 MAR post b

5 MAR post c
6 MAR post a

Welcome home! This #SMK Friday is all about #trendy (trendy) and #hygge (cozy). Put your slippers on and enjoy the moment with books, evening coffee, and sleeping overnight just like home! https://www.facebook.com/events/418200166024026/

2GOcopenhagen

6 MAR post b

Tove Lo will come to #Copenhagen in April 😊 Tickets are now available, don’t miss the chance to meet this #Swedish talent! 😊 #2GOcopenhagen

Tove Lo - VEGA - Musikkens Hus

Der er lagt i kakketøvnen til en stor aftan i selskab med Tove Lo, når hun omdanner Store VEGA til en sjælevandring med "sex, kærlighed og smerte" den 19. januar næste år.

VEGA.DK

6 MAR post c

If you are thinking about dinner, Dalle Valle is probably the best option! Apart from amazing buffet, you can buy 1 get 1 free #cocktails! Bon appetit! 😊 #2GOcopenhagen

Photo: Dalle Valle

7 MAR post a

Did you know that it is free to visit Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek on Sunday? 😊 #2GOcopenhagen

Photo from museum website
7 MAR post b

Any plans tonight? Drop by Studenterhøstet to dance, chill and have fun with great musicians! 😊 #2GOCopenhagen

Ambient Night feat. N.A.S.A + Descroix + Møsterhed 🎤
We will have quality musicians and DJs showing us their takeaway dance music from the worlds of chilled beats and immersive soundscapes.

STUDENTERHJÆLT.COM

Like · Comment · Share · 2

8 MAR post a

Happy International Women's Day! A day to raise awareness about women status worldwide and gender equality. We can #makeithappen 🌈

#2GOCopenhagen

Photo: #IWD2015

Like · Comment · Share · 6 · 2

9 MAR post a

#Lunch recommendation. Sandwich with smoothie from Palæo Plæstræde is a healthy and tasty combination 🍎 Think about it if you do not have lunchbox today 🍜 #2GOCopenhagen

Like · Comment · Share · 14 · 2

9 MAR post b

#Denmark continues to rank high. This time being the 7th most globalised country in the world according to the KOF Globalization Index by ETH Zürich (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich) #2GOCopenhagen

Danish flag

Denmark no. 7 most globalised country in the world
We use cookies for statistical purposes as part of our work to create a good website. Unless you say “no thanks to cookies”, we assume that you agree to our cookie policy.

Like · Comment · Share · 3
10 MAR post a

Bored with #coffee or #tea? #Flowertea might be a good alternative 😊 Some nutritionists say flower tea can reduce stress and boost vitality. It is healthy to drink, easy to make and beautiful to look at 😊 Start by making flower ice cubes and cheers! #2GOcopenhagen

Like · Comment · Share · 4

10 MAR post b

2GOcopenhagen.com shared Koncerthuset's event.
March 10 at 3:20pm · Edited

The biggest and most innovative #electronic #music festival, Sónar Festival will take place in a few days and first time in #Copenhagen. Are you ready? 🎵 #2GOcopenhagen

Like · Comment · Share · 2

11 MAR post a

Soaking up the #sun by #Søerne, god morgen 😊 #2GOcopenhagen
Photo: Christian Scully

Like · Comment · Share · 16

11 MAR post b

Battle between #Denmark and #Sweden continues! The Local Denmark listed 10 reasons why #Copenhagen beats #Stockholm. Who is your winner? 🥇 http://www.thelocal.dk/.../ten-cool-ways-copenhagen-tops-stoc...

#2GOcopenhagen
12 MAR post a

Another sunny day! 😊 Seems like spring (summer?) is coming, time to visit the following spots to enjoy sunbath 🌞 #2GOcopenhagen

Top 10 places to read your book in sunny Copenhagen
The exam is just around the corner and the sun is here, so where to go? Check out our guide to hidden reading spots where you can relax with your textbook while tanning your sunglasses 📚 SUNSETPOST.DK

Like - Comment - Share - 6

12 MAR post b

Yummy afternoon treat at La Glace, one of the finest #cysters in #Copenhagen 🥭 #2GOcopenhagen

Like - Comment - Share - 13

13 MAR post a

Another #blackfriday, but we will be fine 😊 Happy #Friday! 🎉 #2GOcopenhagen

we will be fine ❤️

Like - Comment - Share - 2

13 MAR post b

Time to celebrate #Sunday in an epic way at KB18 kædbomene with cocktails and music! See you 😊 #2GOcopenhagen

SECRET SUNDAY by Kulturshot
Sunday, March 15 at 11.00am
KB18 kædbomene in Copenhagen, Denmark
285 people joined

+ Join
14 MAR post a

Apart from #whitecold today is also Pi Day in the century! 😊 You will have to wait another 100 years to see #pi day fall on 3/14/15 which matches pi's value: 3.1415. Make your own pie and enjoy the day 😊

#2GOCopenhagen

14 MAR post b

Wondering what to do on #Sunday? Here comes our suggestion: Watch a Danish movie with English subtitles at Danish Film Institute! The Missing One (#Fasandæbcen in Danish) will be screened tomorrow 😊

#2GOCopenhagen

Danish on a Sunday

Danish film hits - with English subtitles. We are often asked if the Cinematheque could please show some of the Danish films that foreign audiences have heard of and would appreciate – if only they were subtitled in English. Now we indulge that wish. Danish also
Results from Two-week observation

**RED: VisitCopenhagen  BLUE: 2GOCopenhagen**

*Please note that the base line for calculating percentage is always 14 for VisitCopenhagen and 30 for 2GOCopenhagen. *The sum of percent could be more than 100% because the same post can be coded with more than one value, e.g. if both English and French are used in the post.

**First Section: Facts**

1. **Type of content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>RED</th>
<th>BLUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Photo</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>16 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) News</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Article</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Video</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Other (specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of post</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Language used/shown in content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>RED</th>
<th>BLUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) English</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Danish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Other language (specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Origin of source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin of source</th>
<th>RED</th>
<th>BLUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Authentic/Original Content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) External source from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Blogs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Newspaper/Magazine/Radio/TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Local organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Foreign organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Enterprises/businesses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Individuals</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of post</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Second Section: issue and subject

#### 4. Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Subject</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Festival (concert like)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Dining</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Politics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Daily life</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Culture/custom/tradition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Night life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Travel guide</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Cost of living</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of post</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Related countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Copenhagen/Denmark</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>20 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Other country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Worldwide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of post</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Destination mentioned/shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Historical building/heritage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Cultural events and facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Parks and garden</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Shopping places</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Facilities and infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Entertainment (e.g. Tivoli)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Nature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Restaurant/café/bar</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Government Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Religious place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Street</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of post</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Third section: narrative**

7. **Rhetoric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Self promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Promote 3rd party</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Wish/greet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Describe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Educate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Compete</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Praise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Humor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Call for action</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of post** 14 30

8. **Use of expressive punctuations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) None</td>
<td>11 (79%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) “?”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) “!”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) “…”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of post** 14 30

9. **Use of emotion figure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) No</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of post** 14 30

**Fourth section: connection building**

10. **Potential direct economic benefit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Private enterprise/business</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Public sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of post** 14 30
11. Use of hashtag

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) No</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Use of hyperlink

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) No</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of post 14 30

13. Connection to other platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Social media</th>
<th>External website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Instagram</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) YouTube</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Other Facebook page</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) External website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Self</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Others’</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of post 14 30
Posts related to Copenhagen shooting incident and result

17 FEB (VisitCopenhagen)

16 MAR post a (2GOCopenhagen)

16 MAR post b (2GOCopenhagen)

17 MAR post a (2GOCopenhagen)
General result from Copenhagen shooting

Most content are photos and one link about the memorial event. Except a picture showing “Je suis Danois”, all content were written in English. The topic is of course very direct: politics. Rhetoric is serious and calm aiming to grieve or encourage people to stand strong towards protecting freedom of speech. Due to the seriousness of the event, no expressive punctuations or emotional figures were used.
Appendix 3 Netnography field notes

VisitCopenhagen
Main page

- Profile picture: statue of The Little Mermaid, symbol of the city and caption “VisitCopenhagen”
- Cover photo: less symbolic, along harbor of Ørestad region which is known of modern artistic architecture
- Fans can post to the page
- No “message” button, therefore the only way to contact page admin is to write wall post
- Fans can “like” and reply to posts, from VCPH, wall post to the page and comments made by others
- During observation period, the number of new like is generally 100 everyday, therefore 0.9% increase in “Likes” in one week.
1) Fan’s activities
i) Self-expression: affirmation of Copenhagen

Amazement

Preview of future journey

Nostalgia of home country /Patriotism

- Positive comments are observed, basically did not see any haters/spams
- Showing appreciation of Copenhagen
• Excitement for the next trip (e.g. I am coming in 2 weeks!)
• Danish fans are proud of their own country

ii) Inquiry

Inquiries are posted on the wall
• Questions are about weather, suggestion of places, etc

iii) Advertisement/Promotion
• Advertising of personal blog/page is quite common both as an independent wall post or as a comment to VCPH’s post
• Sometimes the wall post isn’t written directly to the page but VCPH being tagged in a certain post

2) Connection building
i) Reply to each other

“Has anyone been to the Copenhagen Zoo...?
Like · Reply · March 9 at 1:52am
Yes, it’s pretty good.
Like · March 9 at 3:34pm”

ii) “Like” someone’s post

“Beautiful area, beautiful country. One of my favorite places to visit each time I'm in Copenhagen
Like · Reply · March 12 at 5:41pm
I'm so proud to be danish and also to be born in Copenhagen. Now I'm living in Bremen Germany also beautiful but I miss u a lot Copenhagen. That’s my real home!!”
• Fans interact with each other mostly by putting “like” on comment
• On average 2-4 likes on comment
• Comment is rare, only when it is a question: e.g. “Has anyone been to Copenhagen zoo?”
• Interactions on wall post are rare, maybe because wall posts are not very noticeable. They appear on the bottom left corner of the page

iii) Collaboration with VCPH

Good Morning,
We made an article about Copenhagen, Thought we should share it with you 🌟 and would appreciate if you can share it with your fans! — in Copenhagen, Denmark.

Top Things to Do in Copenhagen
Here are our picks for the 10 essential attractions to round out your visit to Copenhagen.

Top 10 Things to Do in Copenhagen

• Some blogs/pages ask VCPH to share their content by writing wall post
• Such request usually will be sent by message, however since users cannot send message to VCPH, writing wall post is the only way
3) Spread of content

i) Replying by relevant photo (creation of content)

ii) Invite friends (tagging friends)
• When VCPH’s post is about certain places, like Nyhavn it was quite usual to see fans commenting with their own picture of the same place
• Fans also tag their friends sometimes to share the information, as a suggestion, as a reminiscence of memory, etc.

4) Authenticity
i) Fake profile

• Some of the accounts look fake
• With no information, no “Add Friend” or “Message” button
ii) Repetition in “likes”

1\(^{st}\) time

When going through the list of “likes”, some users appear repeatedly. This user appeared 3 times therefore the actual way Facebook calculates “likes” is very doubtful.
2GOCopenhagen

Main page

- Profile picture: simple blue logo with “2GO”
- Cover photo: 2GOCOPENHANGE.com at Happy Wall in central Copenhagen. Everyone can turn the bricks on the wall to make words or patterns
- Wall post is not allowed
- Possibility to send message to the page directly
- Fans can like/comment on 2GO’s posts and others’ comments
- 3 new likes in 1 week, 0.13 % weekly increase in likes

1) Fan’s activities
   i) Appreciation
ii) Personal feedback/information supplement

- Comment is quite rare generally, less than 10 comments from fans in a week
- Show appreciation/recognition of the content
- Fans share their own experience with specific place mentioned in the post

2) Connection building

i) Like someone’s comment
• As mentioned above comment is rare therefore fans interaction was also rare
• Some of them received likes on comment, 1-2 on average

3) Spread of content
i) Invite friends

• Fan may invite friends for their opinion and participation

4) Authenticity
• No fake accounts observed
• Number of likes matches the number of people shown on the list
Appendix 4 Survey questions

1) How often do you use Facebook?
   □ Never
   □ Less than once a month
   □ Once a month
   □ 2-3 Times a month
   □ Once a week
   □ 3-5 Times a week
   □ Daily

2) When you are on Facebook, what activities do you engage in?
   Never/once-seldom-sometimes-often-(almost) each time
   i) Read news
   ii) Share content with friends (link/photo/video/status)
   iii) Chat/message with friends
   iv) Check up friends’ updates
   v) Check events

3) Apart from 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen, are you a fan of other pages related to Copenhagen/ Denmark? (e.g. Copenhagen Post, the Local, AOK, Scandinavian Standard)
   □ Yes
   □ No

4) What made you “like” 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen page?
   □ Friends’ activities on the page appear on newsfeed
   □ From “suggested post”
   □ Saw from other social media platform (e.g. Twitter, google plus, Instagram)
   □ Voluntary search on Facebook
□ Voluntary search on search engine (e.g. Google, Yahoo, Duckduckgo)

5) What do you use 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen page for? Please choose up to 2 options

□ Entertainment/ Leisure
□ Gain knowledge about Copenhagen/Denmark
□ Get updates about events
□ See interesting pictures
□ Academic/occupational purpose

6) How often do you visit 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen page?

□ Daily
□ Few times a week (3-5 times)
□ Once a week
□ Irregularly
  o When posts appear on newsfeed
  o When you want to check some information
□ Only once when you became a fan

7) If you DO revisit 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen page, what made you do that?

□ Posts appear on newsfeed
□ Genuine interest
□ Search result from hashtags
□ Voluntary visit

8) How frequently do you engage on 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen page?

Never/once-seldom-sometimes-often-(almost) each time

i) Like
ii) Comment
iii) Share content on your Facebook page
iv) Share content to specific Facebook group
v) Link click/photo click/hashtag click

9) If you DO engage on 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen, why do you do that? Please choose up to 2 options that

□ Show appreciation/agreement
□ Self-expression
□ Spread message to friends-specific group
□ Save information in “activity log”

10) How much do you agree with the following statements:
1: strong disagree, 2: disagree, 3: neutral/no opinion, 4 agree, 5 strong agree

• 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen is designed for non-locals
• 2gocopenhagen/VisitCopenhagen page is an open and participatory platform
• 2gocopenhagen/VisitCopenhagen promotes Copenhagen
• 2gocopenhagen/VisitCopenhagen guides Copenhagen experience
• 2gocopenhagen/VisitCopenhagen makes it easier for non-locals to integrate to Danish culture
• 2gocopenhagen/VisitCopenhagen caters audiences’ need and preferences

11) Have you visited place/ participated in events after seeing related posts on 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen?
□ Yes □ No

12) If you DID, how many times approximately?

13) Did 2gocopenhagen/visitcopenhagen provide some information (e.g. fun facts about Denmark) that you did not know about?
□ Yes
□ No
14) What is your gender?
□ Female
□ Male

15) What is your age?
□ 15 or younger
□ 16-20
□ 21-30
□ 31-40
□ 41-50
□ 51-60
□ 61 or above

16) Where are you from?
□ Denmark (Faroe Island included)
□ Other Nordic countries (Sweden, Finland, Norway, Iceland)
□ Europe (Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Iceland not included)
□ North/ South America
□ Asia
□ Australia/New Zealand
□ Africa

17) Where do you currently live?
□ Copenhagen
□ Other cities in Denmark
□ Outside Denmark

18) If you live in Copenhagen, how long have you been here?
□ I am from Copenhagen
□ less than 6 months
19) If you live in Copenhagen, what do you do here? You can choose **up to 2 options**

- I am from Copenhagen
- Work (internship included)
- Job-seeking/starting business
- Study
- Green card holder
- Asylum
Appendix 5 Selection of survey report

VisitCopenhagen

1. How often do you use Facebook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less than Once a Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Once a Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3 Times a Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Once a Week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-5 Times a Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Apart from VisitCopenhagen, are you a fan of other pages related to Copenhagen/Denmark? (e.g. Copenhagen Post, the Local, AOK, Scandinavian Standard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **What made you "like" VisitCopenhagen page?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Friends' activities on the page (like/comment) appear on news feed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>From &quot;suggested post&quot; Saw from other social media platform (e.g. Twitter, google plus, Instagram)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Voluntary search on Facebook</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Voluntary search on search engine (e.g. Google, Yahoo, Duckduckgo)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **What do you use VisitCopenhagen page for? Please choose up to 2 options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Entertainment/leisure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gain knowledge about Copenhagen/Denmark</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Get updates about event</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>See interesting pictures/videos</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic/occupational purpose</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. If you DO revisit the page, what made you do that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Posts appear on newsfeed</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genuine interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Search result from hashtags</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Voluntary visit</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If you DID engage on VisitCopenhagen page, why do you do that? Please choose up to 2 options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Show appreciation/agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spread message to friends/specific group</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Save information in &quot;activity log&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10. How much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strong disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/no opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strong agree</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VisitCopenhagen is designed for non-locals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VisitCopenhagen page is an open and participatory platform</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VisitCopenhagen promotes Copenhagen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VisitCopenhagen guides Copenhagen experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VisitCopenhagen makes it easier for non-locals to integrate to Danish culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VisitCopenhagen caters audience’s need and preference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Have you visited place/ participate in events after seeing related post on VisitCopenhagen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Did VisitCopenhagen provide some information (e.g. fun facts about Denmark) that you did not know about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Where do you currently live? (Destinations you are currently on travel are not considered as living place)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other cities in Denmark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outside Denmark</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. How often do you use Facebook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less than Once a Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Once a Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3 Times a Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Once a Week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-5 Times a week</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Apart from 2GOCopenhagen, are you a fan of other pages related to Copenhagen/ Denmark? (e.g. Copenhagen Post, the Local, AOK, Scandinavian Standard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **What made you "like" 2GOCopenhagen page?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Friends' activities on the page (like/comment) appear on news feed</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>From &quot;suggested post&quot; Saw from other social media platform (e.g. Twitter, google plus, Instagram)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Voluntary search on Facebook</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Voluntary search on search engine (e.g. Google, Yahoo, Duckduckgo)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **What do you use 2GOCopenhagen page for? Please choose up to 2 options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Entertainment/leisure</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gain knowledge about Copenhagen/Denmark</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Get updates about events</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>See interesting pictures/videos</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic/occupational purpose</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. If you DO revisit the page, what made you do that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Posts appear on newsfeed</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genuine interest</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Search result from hashtags</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Voluntary visit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If you DO engage on 2GOCopenhagen page, why do you do that? Please choose up to 2 options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Show appreciation/agreement</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spread message to friends/specific group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Save information in &quot;activity log&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 10. How much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strong disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/no opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strong agree</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2GOCopenhagen is designed for non-locals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2GOCopenhagen page is an open and participatory platform</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2GOCopenhagen promotes Copenhagen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2GOCopenhagen guides Copenhagen experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2GOCopenhagen makes it easier for non-locals to integrate to Danish culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2GOCopenhagen caters audiences’ need and preference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11. Have you visited place/participated in events after seeing related post on 2GOCopenhagen page?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Did 2GOCopenhagen provide some information (e.g fun facts about Denmark) you did not know about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17. Where do you currently live? (Destinations you are currently on travel are not considered as living place)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other cities in Denmark</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outside Denmark</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>