Abstract

Creative and efficient usage of social media communications by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) is now one of the ways that they can foster their public relations activities, interact with others, educate the public about their existential objectives, and facilitate multi-directional information exchange. Therefore, it is vital for them to structure the determinants of message framing accurately to facilitate their goals. To the extent of the authors’ knowledge, there is no study in Turkey that focuses on this issue for NGOs. Thus, this study aims to explore message framing determinants on Facebook through a content analysis. Moreover, the types of message framing determinants which elicit more Facebook responses are identified. Results are also compared with the Facebook posts of Turkish NGOs and Greenpeace, which is one of the most powerful NGOs on an international basis. Findings reveal that Turkish NGOs share posts on Facebook with a limited usage of public education and call to action content, lower usage of rich media solutions, and prevention focus. Besides, it is found that posts on special occasion days, “single” messages, having an “informational”, “community building” content, and “altruistic” focus receive more likes. It is also remarkable that volunteer testimonials trigger more response from the followers of these pages. Additionally, the comparison between Turkish NGOs and Greenpeace International revealed some notable differences in terms of message determinants.
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Introduction

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), which are the promising actors in global economy and politics, are playing an important role in creating social influence over world leaders and policy makers to make them pay attention to the social welfare problems faced by humanity. The introduction of social media applications has provided new communication tools for NGOs to reach their objectives, like raising awareness, community building, fundraising and calls to action. Therefore, considering the importance of disseminating the messages of NGOs and the manner in which to engage supporters and influencers, as well as the types of content to disseminate, this study analyzes NGOs’ usage of social media to enhance their communicative functions. Social media engagement of NGOs is a recent issue in Turkey and the literature review reveals that studies in this area are limited. But the field of social media applications of NGOs seems to be of growing interest for researchers; considering their contributions for the enhancement of interactive communication opportunities with the public. It is also observed that there is a gap in the Turkish literature about how NGOs frame and form the content of their messages within their social media posts, which is deemed an important issue to attract the attention of the public and to build a community. Hereby, the aim of this research is to analyze the Facebook posts of the NGOs and to explore their message framing determinants. The aim is also to identify whether responses (like, share, comment) differ according to the types...
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of framing determinants. Facebook, which is one of the most popular social networking sites in Turkey, is chosen as the basis for the research and a content analysis is conducted on posts on the Facebook pages of five NGOs with various fields of interest.

Social Media and NGOs

A global transformation in various leading areas such as political decisions and applications, economic and business dynamics, consumption of the global consumer, and social networking is needed to solve the current social, economic and ecologic problems globally. Grant (2010, p. 172) suggests a paradigm shift "from consumer to citizen", in order to put cooperative responsibility into action. NGOs, which are private, non-profit, professional organizations, with a distinctive legal character, concerned with public welfare goals (Clarke, 1998, p.36) play an important role in the society to facilitate this paradigm shift. NGO networks share new information, reframe existing problems, and inform public opinion by engaging the news media in order to raise global awareness, thereby encouraging governments to take action (Bob, 2005, 2009; Bogert, 2011; Burgerman, 2001; Froehling, 1997; Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Khagram & Sikkink, 2002; Price, 1998, 2003; Risse-Kappen et al., 1999; Ron et al., 2005; Shipper, 2012 as cited in Thral et al., 2014, p. 2). Due to the advancement in information technologies, creative and efficient usage of social media communication of NGOs has become one of the ways to transform the society.

Social networking sites like Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Flickr and MySpace are among the popular brands of social networking. They are web-based services that allow individuals to construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system (Boyd & Ellison, 2007, p. 211). There are various marketing practices of companies embracing social networks, but the applications are not restricted to for-profit organizations. Not-for-profit organizations are also engaged with social media to foster their public relations activities, to streamline their management functions, to interact with volunteers and donors, to educate others about their programs and services, and to facilitate multi-directional information exchange, and location-based tracking and messaging (Bernhardt et al., 2012; Waters, 2009; Waters et al., 2009; Yaşmurlu, 2013). A research study conducted on the largest 200 charities in the US has shown that Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and blogging are now the most common tools used for social marketing (Barnes, 2010). There are many evidences that NGOs are engaged in social media, enabling them to disseminate their campaigns and to call society to action (Lambert, 2014; Paturyan et al., 2014; Seo et al., 2009; Shim, 2014; Silva, 2012; Thrall et al., 2014; Zbuche & Bira, 2012). On the other hand, NGOs' engagement in social media is a recent issue in Turkey. The importance of social media in public relations activities is appreciated by the professionals but the virtual world applications are the least adopted modes of communication (Alikiliç & Atabek, 2012; Marangoz, 2007;). Akdoğan et al. (2012) reported that respondents find TV social marketing campaigns (72.6%) more attractive than campaigns on the Internet (18.9%). Besides, the most common and trusted source of information for NGOs in Turkey has been found to be “friends and peers”, whereas the least trusted source was “social media” (Özel, 2011). A research on two women’s associations questioning the existence of these NGOs in social media points out that there is no directly responsible person for social media management and their existence is weak (Solmaz & Gorkemli, 2012). Another study examining the Facebook and Twitter pages of five NGOs in Turkey puts forward that NGOs reach their aims of raising awareness, increasing recognition, building communication, and the dissemination of information. However, the research also concludes that social networking sites are “partially” motivating for activity in the real world and fundraising (Onat, 2010). Considering the importance of evaluating the appropriate platforms to disseminate the messages of NGOs and the manner in which to engage supporters and influencers as well as the types of content to disseminate (Villarino, 2011), it can be concluded that online social networking is a very new media for NGOs to use to perform their social marketing activities in Turkey.
Message Framing Determinants in Social Marketing

Several authors have discussed the framing paradigm in the literature. It is defined as a way of selecting some aspects of perceived reality and making them more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to the audience in a communicating text (Entman, 1993). Empirical studies about message framing have been carried out regarding different fields of individual behavior. For example, Ganzach and Karsahi (1995) analyzed the impact of message frame on credit card usage. Furthermore, some of the existing studies focused on the role and influence of framing on social marketing (e.g. Kolandai-Matchett, 2009; Zhao & Pechmann, 2007). Primary framing determinants in social marketing within a holistic model are identified as “content, time horizon, focus, direction, and tonality” by Helmig and Thaler (2010).

First, the “content” determinant was categorized as informational/promotional/community building messages, messages focusing on prevention/detection behavior, qualitative/quantitative messages, single/multiple message(s), and messages with unknown/know facts (e.g. Guidry, Waters, & Saxton, 2014; Helmig & Thaler, 2010; Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). In the context of informational messages, information relating to the organization’s activities, events or any other news, facts, or reports is shared with the organization’s stakeholders if relevant to them (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). Informational messages are classified as “marketing messages”, which focus on giving information about the organization and past events, and “public education messages”, which concentrate on educating the public about the issues advocated by the organization (Guidry et al., 2014). Promotional messages are taken into consideration as “call-to-action messages”, which direct the stakeholders to become involved with the organization through methods that are not contributing financially to the organization or involve attending events; “events and promotion messages”, which underline the opportunities for stakeholders to become engaged with the organization by participating in future online or offline activity hosted by the organization; and finally, “fundraising messages”, which focus on raising money for the organization (Saxton & Waters, 2014). The second determinant is the time horizon of the message in terms of emergence of consequences (Thaler & Helmig, 2013). Therefore, aligned with the objectives of this study, the following research questions are proposed:

Research Question 1: What is the message content of Facebook posts of Turkish NGOs?

Research Question 2: What is the time horizon of Facebook posts of Turkish NGOs?

Research Question 3: What is the message focus of Facebook posts of Turkish NGOs?

Fourth, the “direction” determinant of the messages is identified as positive or negative and gain or loss framed in the literature (e.g. Block & Keller, 1995, Rothman & Salovey, 1997). Prospect theory is the fundamental theory of message framing research (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979, 1982; Tversky & Kahneman, 1981), which states that individuals’ decisions change across options framed as gains or losses under risky conditions. Tversky and Kahneman (1981) introduced this theory through framing an Asian disease problem. The possible outcomes of the outbreak of an Asian disease were framed as gains in one scenario and as losses in the other scenario. Individuals chose the certain outcome of saving people in the gain framed version whereas they chose to take the risk of losing a certain amount of people in the loss scenario. Social marketing research benefits from these framing effects in the aim of persuading people to act for the desired outcome (e.g., Arthur & Quester 2004; Banks et. al., 1995; Bennett 1996; Wymer, 2010). In the literature, some argue that when persuading individuals for a certain action, positive framing is more effective (Levin & Gaeth, 1988), whereas others state that negative framing can induce more action (Meierowitz & Chaiken, 1987). Rothman and Salovey (1997) reviewed how prospect theory can be utilized...
for developing maximally persuasive health messages and revealed that loss-framed appeals were more effective in motivating behavioral outcomes. Therefore, the previous discussion leads to the following research question:

Research Question 4: What is the message direction of Facebook posts of Turkish NGOs?

Last, but not least, “message tonality”, as the fifth determinant identifies the intensity of gain and loss frames. Gains and losses emphasized in the message can be emotional or rational (Helmig & Thaler, 2010). Emotions are important predictors of voluntary actions and some emotions such as pride, hope, optimism, guilt relief are mentioned in the social marketing literature (Laverie & McDonald, 2007). Additionally, Brennan and Binney (2010) mention that social marketers need to consider the use of fear, guilt and shame as negative emotional appeals to gain voluntary compliance. Based on these studies, the following research question is generated:

Research Question 5: What is the message tonality of Facebook posts of Turkish NGOs?

Persuasion processes may vary within and across nationalities and people may display various responses when exposed to message frames (Orth et al., 2007). With insufficient evidence for comparing the social media posts of NGOs from different countries, the following research question is put forward:

Research Question 6: How does the use of message framing determinants on Facebook with respect to (a) message content, (b) time horizon, (c) message focus, (d) message direction (e) message tonality differ between the Turkish NGOs and Greenpeace International?

Responses towards different message framing determinants differ apart from types of media. While Guidry et al. (2014) focused on social marketing efficiency on Twitter; Saxton and Waters (2014) analyzed stakeholders’ attitude towards social marketing on Facebook. In this context, the following research question and the derived hypothesis are proposed:

Research Question 7: Which types of message framing determinants elicit more Facebook responses with respect to (a) like, (b) comment, and (c) share?

Methodology

The main goal of this study is to analyze the Facebook posts of the NGOs and to explore their message framing determinants. In this framework, the first part of the research was planned as an exploratory study and content analysis is conducted to investigate the posts on Facebook. Besides, the aim is also to find out whether responses (like, share, comment) differ according to the types of framing determinants, and hypotheses tests were applied to reach this objective. A list of all NGOs that operate in Turkey was attained through the government’s official site “e-government”. The list of 56 foundations concerned with several social welfare issues was categorized by the authors into 5 groups: health, culture and education, environment, society and profession. Foundations for professionals are disregarded from the analysis within the scope of this study.

There were 8 NGOs engaged in health issues; 18 in culture and education; 5 in environment and 17 NGOs in the field of society. Facebook pages of all of these NGOs were visited and the number of followers of each page was recorded: “Foundation for Children with Leukemia - LÖSEV” (health) (519,845 followers); “İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts - İKSV” (culture and education) (120,343 followers); “Educational Volunteers Foundation of Turkey - TEGV” (culture and education) (120,343 followers); “The Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, for Reforestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats - TEMA” (environment) (346,174 followers); “Community Volunteers Foundation (TOG)” (society) (140,000 followers). These were found to be the NGOs with the highest number of followers on Facebook in each category (as of February 2015). Additionally, to compare the results with an international NGO, Greenpeace, which was established 40 years ago and is defined as the world’s most powerful NGO by The Times (Greenpeace, 2011) was selected and the international Facebook page of Greenpeace (2,073,512 followers as of February 2015) was examined. Further analyses were conducted on the mentioned sample of 6 NGOs. Each post shared by NGOs between the dates of 01.10.2014 - 31.12.2014 are analyzed. The database contained the 152 posts for this period. The classification scheme was designed based on message framing determinants of Helmig and Thaler (2010), which proves
content validity of this study. Two authors coded the first 10 posts of each NGO based on the coding protocol separately. Discrepancies between codings were discussed and coding protocol was revised until 100% agreement was reached. Using the refined coding protocol, two scholars coded all posts with 90% inter-coder agreement.

Findings
112 posts were shared by 5 Turkish NGOs during the selected time period on Facebook. During that period, LÖSEV has highest total number of likes ($N_L=138,978$), comments ($N_C=1,099$), and shares ($N_S=13,637$) among the Turkish NGOs. Greenpeace International (Greenpeace Int.) shared 40 posts in 3 months period and leads these findings by having the highest number of likes/comments/shares per post (Table 1).

When the dates of posts shared on Facebook pages are analyzed, it can be seen that posts shared by both groups of NGOs are during ordinary days (Turkish NGOs 75%-Greenpeace Int. 95%) whereas the percentage is much higher for Greenpeace Int. since they target a wider variety of audience worldwide. On the other hand, it should be mentioned that Turkish NGOs are giving special attention to feasts and public holidays and celebrate these days on Facebook pages. They are also sometimes organizing special events by targeting their communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Number of Posts in 3 Months Period</th>
<th>Number of Likes ($N_L$)</th>
<th>Number of likes per Post</th>
<th>Number of Comments ($N_C$)</th>
<th>Number of Comments per Post</th>
<th>Number of Shares ($N_S$)</th>
<th>Number of Shares per Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LÖSEV</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>138,978</td>
<td>5345.31</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>42.27</td>
<td>13,637</td>
<td>524.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31,424</td>
<td>1208.62</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>122.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEGV</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13,806</td>
<td>460.20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>25.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>143.43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İKSV</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>91.13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total for Turkish NGOs</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>187,674</strong></td>
<td><strong>1675.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1425</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>17835</strong></td>
<td><strong>159.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenpeace Int.</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>250,969</strong></td>
<td><strong>6274.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,656</strong></td>
<td><strong>391.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>147,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>3677.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The message content of the posts classified under subgroups can be seen on Table 2. According to chi-square analysis, Turkish NGOs and Greenpeace Int. differ through some message content determinants of informational, marketing, public education, call-to-action, events and promotion content, qualitative and quantitative information, post with texts, links and hashtags. Most of the posts shared by Greenpeace Int. have informational content (92.5%), which is in accordance with Turkish NGOs (73.2%). Both Greenpeace Int. (82.5%) and Turkish NGOs (67%) mostly share posts with marketing content. Although Turkish NGOs share posts that include events and promotion content (37.5%), most of the posts shared by Greenpeace Int. cover call-to-action content (30%). Both groups of NGOs share posts mostly with text (Greenpeace Int. 97.5%, Turkish NGOs 85.7%) and qualitative content (Greenpeace Int. 87.5%, Turkish NGOs 98.2%) whereas Greenpeace Int. significantly has more links within its posts (80%). Lastly, 24.1% of posts shared by Turkish include hashtags in which most of them refer directly to the related issues with the post.
### Table 2. Message Content and Time Horizon of the Social Media Posts of Selected NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Post</th>
<th>Turkish NGOs f (n=112)</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Greenpeace Int. f (n=40)</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posts with Informational Content</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>6.450*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with Promotional Content</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>1.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with Community Building Content</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with Marketing Content</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>3.459**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with Public Education Content</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>30.902*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with Call-to-action Content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.858*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with Events and Promotion Content</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.397*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with qualitative information</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with quantitative information</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>4.826*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with texts</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>4.121*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with photos</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>2.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with videos</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with tags</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with hashtags</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37.317*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term oriented posts</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>2.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term oriented or timeless posts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that these are the percentages within overall posts; b 23 of hashtags refer directly to the related issues with post; 11 of them refer to broader issues; ‘p < .05; ‘p < .01

### Table 3. Message Focus of the Social Media Posts of Selected NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Focus</th>
<th>Turkish NGOs f (n=112)</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Greenpeace Int. f (n=40)</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posts with egoistic focus (self oriented)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.953*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with altruistic focus (other oriented)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12.822*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts with biospheric focus (other oriented)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>68.494*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts focusing on prevention behavior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.334*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity testimonial</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.383*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert testimonial</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer testimonial</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that these are the percentages within overall posts; ‘p < .05; ‘p < .01
When the message focus of the NGOs are analyzed, while Turkish NGOs focus on altruistic messages (69.6%), Greenpeace Int. focuses on biospheric posts (87.5%) which is an expected outcome due to the organization’s mission. Both groups share posts focusing on prevention behavior and Turkish NGOs share significantly higher number of posts that have celebrity testimonials (32.1%) compared to Greenpeace Int. (7.5%) (Table 3).

Table 4 indicates that Greenpeace Int. shares significantly more posts with a negative frame (Greenpeace Int. 30%-Turkish NGOs 6.3%) and one-sided message (Greenpeace Int. 60%-Turkish NGOs 43.8%). While Turkish NGOs focus more on gain-framed posts (42.9%), Greenpeace Int. focuses on loss-framed posts (32.5%). Greenpeace Int. shares significantly higher number of posts that are positively framed and have an “avoid loss” direction (Greenpeace Int. 10%-Turkish NGOs 0.9%) and negatively framed with “suffer loss” direction (Greenpeace Int. 27.5%-Turkish NGOs 2.7%).

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is employed to observe the differences between Facebook posts shared by Turkish NGOs, and responses towards these posts in terms of likes, comments and shares (Table 6).

Posts that are significantly liked more are: informational (µ=1728, F=3.464, p<.05); special occasion...
day posts (µ=3419.5, F=31.712, p<.05); altruistic (µ=1508.9, F=2.546, p<.01); posts with volunteer testimonial (µ=2167.4, F=4.978, p<.05); posts with single message (µ=1906, F=6.346, p<.05). Posts that are significantly commented on and shared more are special occasion day posts (µ=33, F=25.855, p<.05; µ=322.2, F=34.693, p<.05).

**Conclusion**

Social media enhances the interactive communication opportunities with the public; therefore it is believed that the creative and efficient usage of social media by NGOs is an important key to transform the society from "consumer to citizen". The content, focus, direction and tonality of messages, which are determinants of message framing, are claimed to have a persuasive and influencing effect on the objectives of NGOs, like raising awareness, community building, calls to action or fundraising. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the current usage of these determinants to enhance the communicative functions of Turkish NGOs. Regarding the number of posts shared, it can be concluded that Turkish NGOs do not facilitate Facebook effectively. The findings pinpoint that Turkish NGOs share posts on Facebook with a limited usage of public education and call to action content, less usage of rich media solutions, and prevention focus.
Moreover, another important conclusion of this study within an international context is that Greenpeace uses more negatively framed and loss-framed messages while Turkish NGOs prefer positively framed and gain-framed messages. The rationale behind this fact can be the level of involvement in NGOs and cultural differences which needs further research. The findings also revealed that posts on special occasion days, “single” messages, having an “informational”, “community building” content, “altruistic” focus get more likes. It is also remarkable that volunteer testimonials trigger more response from the followers of these pages.

Turkish NGOs should recognize the need to go beyond their aim of not just existing on Facebook but also facilitate the necessary usage of message framing and social media communication functions. The impact of this study stems from being a pioneer attempt to use message framing determinants within a holistic approach. This study can be extended by analyzing the content of comments and its relationship with message frame determinants, with larger scales of posts and NGOs from different fields.
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