

Exploring COVID-19's effect on nonprofit organizations' online communication

MASTER THESIS
EMIL PENDERUP KJÆHR

CULTURE, COMMUNICATION & GLOBALIZATION

Table of contents

Abstract	3
Introduction.....	5
Literature review	6
Problem formulation	6
Method	7
Research Approach	7
Philosophical world view.....	7
Facebook posts.....	8
The interview	8
Methodology	10
Stakeholder defined.....	10
Crisis defined	11
Kræftens Bekæmpelse.....	11
Web 2.0.....	12
Theory	13
Information, Community and Action.....	13
Three-Stage Approach	16
Precrisis.....	16
Crisis Event.....	18
Social Media	21
Postcrisis	22
Analysis.....	23
Facebook posts of Kræftens Bekæmpelse	23
Facebook posts from before the COVID-19 pandemic	23

EXPLORING COVID-19'S EFFECT ON NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS' ONLINE COMMUNICATION

Facebook posts from during the COVID-19 pandemic	26
Comparison of posts before and during COVID-19 pandemic.....	29
Crisis communication interview	32
Proactive Management Functions.....	32
Form and content of communication	37
Social media.....	40
Discussion	42
Conclusion	44
References.....	46
Website content.....	47

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has created an unusual situation for many organizations, as the effects of the virus has meant employees have had to isolate themselves, business have decreased, and in worst case organizations have had to lay-off employees or have gone bankrupt. This crisis has inevitably also affected nonprofit organizations who often work at benefit of the people (Collins, n.d.). This study sought to understand how the online communication of nonprofit organizations have changed and been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, as both the organizations and the stakeholders have been affected by the crisis of the virus. The nonprofit organization which was studied was the Danish cancer charity organization Kræftens Bekæmpelse, who does cancer research and supports cancer patients and relations.

The data which was analyzed in this paper consisted of posts from Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook page from a period before and during the COVID-19 pandemic and an interview with the Head of Communication and Organizational Development at Kræftens Bekæmpelse. The data from Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook posts were analyzed using a classification scheme to be able to classify the online communication and the organizational type in the chosen periods. The interview with the Head of Communication and Organizational Development was analyzed and interpreted using a crisis management theory to study the affect of the COVID-19 crisis.

Through the analysis it was found that Kræftens Bekæmpelse changed their online communication on Facebook due to the crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic. In the analyzed period in 2019 they focused on recruiting volunteers for their nationwide fundraiser, however in the same period in 2020 Kræftens Bekæmpelse had shifted their focus to communicating information to their stakeholders as the nationwide fundraiser was postponed. Kræftens Bekæmpelse's online communication was affected by this in that they began using Facebook donations instead and had the strategy to answer all questions their stakeholders might have immediately, at the risk of answering insufficiently or wrong. Kræftens Bekæmpelse's online communication was also affected by the crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic in that they focused on making sure patients kept going to treatments and patients social distancing worries. Furthermore, they build a Q&A site on their website and communicated with stakeholders on Facebook, in order to answer questions and through training their employees they managed to speak with one voice and show their availability

EXPLORING COVID-19'S EFFECT ON NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS' ONLINE COMMUNICATION

in doing this. Lastly, it was found that because of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's presence on social media they were able to use their Facebook page effectively to inform their stakeholders when the crisis erupted.

This paper sought to add to the knowledge on the effects of a pandemic crisis on organizations, knowledge which for the moment is scarce. Hopefully, this paper can assist organizations if or when a new pandemic breaks out and creates a crisis.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected people all over the world in numerous ways. As of December 25, 2020, the World Health Organization's website states that more than 1,700,000 people have lost their lives to the coronavirus, numbers which steadily grows. In addition, WHO states that there are more than 78,000,000 confirmed cases of COVID-19 which have left people all over the world isolated from their loved ones. Countries have been on lockdown for weeks, and the population have had to learn to live in a world where they cannot go to work, go shopping or be social.

In a globalized world a virus quickly turns into an epidemic, and an epidemic quickly turns into a pandemic. In Denmark, more than 1000 people have lost their lives, while more than 140,000 confirmed cases of the virus have been found, according to the Danish Health Authority's website as of December 25, 2020. Even though Denmark is a small country, these numbers are the signs of an effective lockdown, however the corona virus has had a significant effect on some of the most vulnerable people – cancer patients. In March 2020, the Danish Prime Minister declared, that Denmark would go into a lockdown, because of the COVID-19 pandemic. The lockdown was lifted later, however several restrictions continued still, all of which affected cancer patients greatly. Many organizations have struggled during the COVID-19 pandemic, losing employees, who have had to self-isolate, or even have had to been laid off because of the financial impact of a lockdown. Even more so for nonprofit organizations, which, as the name suggests, do not have profit to act as a crisis buffer.

The Web 2.0 have created a world where organizations can communicate to their stakeholders at any time, updating them on what the organization does and selling products. This also means that during a crisis, organizations can communicate to their stakeholders about the crisis and what the organization is doing to lessen the impact of the crisis. However, this crisis communication must be done right, or the crisis might worsen for the organization, even if the crisis is caused by outside factors like the COVID-19 pandemic (Coombs 2012, 15-16). As the world is now experiencing a second large wave of the coronavirus, this paper will study the effects the disease has had on the nonprofit cancer organization's communication in such a crisis, where another disease takes the attention and restricts cancer patients.

Literature review

The study of online communication from nonprofit organizations is not a new phenomenon. Waters, Burnett, Lamm and J. Lucas studied how social media was being used by nonprofit organizations, by doing a content analysis of 275 nonprofit organizations' Facebook profiles, through which they found that nonprofit organizations were not using social media to its full potential (Waters, Burnett, Lamm & Lucas 2009, 102-106). While the article studies Facebook and nonprofit organizations online communication, it was however published 11 years ago in a time when social media were new and did not focus on how a crisis affected nonprofit organizations.

A more recent study was made by E. Lucas, who studied how UK cancer charity organization used Facebook, by analyzing their Facebook posts, through which she found, that Facebook was used to build on their online communities (Lucas 2017, 1-9). As with Waters, Burnett, Lamm and Lucas, the article does focus on nonprofit organizations and Facebook, however the COVID-19 pandemic created an unusual situation, and Lucas did not study the change in online communication.

Greer and Moreland, however, did study the change in online communication when they studied how the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001 affected the websites of American Airlines and United Airlines. Based on crisis communication theory they studied the crisis response and found that both companies provided instant response, and that their websites allowed them to update their stakeholders frequently. Interestingly they focused on a crisis outside the organization, and how communication changed, however they only focused on websites, as the article is 17 years old (Greer & Moreland 2003, 427-441).

Problem formulation

Based on the issue and the scarce recent focus on how nonprofit organizations' online communication changes in a crisis, and the unusual situation which the COVID-19 pandemic has created, this paper seeks to determine how a crisis, like the COVID-19 pandemic, has changed the way nonprofit cancer organizations communicate to their stakeholders.

Based on this, the following problem statement has been made:

How has nonprofit organizations' online communication been affected by and changed during the crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic?

Method

In this chapter, the research approach, sampling of data and methodology will be presented.

Research Approach

In this paper, the qualitative method will be applied. By applying the qualitative method, the data will be collected in the field, as opposed to in a lab for example, in the form of sampling Facebook posts and conducting an interview. Using this method, the two sets of data are collected and analyzed separately, and subsequently compared and interpreted, thereby supplying each other. Thus, the data from Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook page will be analyzed, followed by the analysis of the interview of an employee from Kræftens Bekæmpelse, and finally compared and interpreted in a discussion and thereby formed into a conclusive answer to the problem formulation. The double analysis is chosen, knowing that this is a more time-consuming approach, as two, instead of one analysis are being conducted, however based on the abovementioned, this is seen as the best way of obtaining a complete understanding. If only the data from the interview would be analyzed, there could be an uncertainty connected to this, as the conclusion would be built on data from a person employed by the studied organization, making that person somewhat biased. The role of the researcher is to be critical in the analysis, however by using another analysis to supply or deny the interpretations, the uncertainties are lessened (Creswell 2014, 234-253).

Philosophical world view

In the paper, the constructivist world view is applied. This world view builds on the understanding that every individual has their own subjective understanding of reality, and the researcher's role is to delve into this reality. Thus, the researcher must rely on the participants' reality in the study, and interpret this reality, recognizing that the researcher's own background shapes the interpretation (Creswell 2014, 37-38). Thus, interpretivism is used to allow the researcher to visit and understand this subjective understanding of the participant's reality. Human behavior here is viewed as

meaningful, and the researcher must interpret the meaning behind this behavior (Bryman 2016, 26-28).

Facebook posts

In order to answer the problem formulation, data from Facebook posts from a period during the COVID-19 pandemic and the same period from the year before was collected, to be able to analyze how the online communication normally is, and how it has changed. The extant method was used in the collection of Facebook data, as the data were collected without the researcher intervening or influencing the data (Salmons 2018, 182-184). Denmark went into lockdown on March 11, 2020 and as this is when people were heavily affected by the COVID-19 pandemic (Regeringen 2020), this is where the sample of Facebook posts begins. The samples then continue one month, to April 11, to be able to get a comprehensive view into how the intense lockdown, caused by COVID-19, affected the nonprofit organization. Thus, all Facebook posts from March 11, 2019 to April 11, 2019 and March 11, 2020 to April 11, 2020 were collected by taking screenshots of each one, and then categorizing them based on the theory, which will be presented later. From March 11, 2019 to April 11, 2019 55 posts were sampled, and from March 11, 2020 to April 11, 2020 53 posts were sampled. In sampling from Facebook, the possibility of the administrator removing post or changing posts from its original form always exists, however this is not seen as an obstruction in the data collection, as it is the posts that are present which are the representation of the online communication, not what has been. In other words, it is about what is represented on the Facebook page.

The Facebook posts will be analyzed using a qualitative content analysis based on the theory, which will be presented later. This entails searching for themes in the posts. These themes are used to categorize the posts in order to find any concordances or discrepancies in order to answer the problem formulation (Bryman 2016, 562-566).

The interview

In order to answer the problem formulation, an interview was conducted with the Head of Communication and Organizational Development at Kræftens Bekæmpelse, who represents the

expert knowledge needed to answer the problem formulation, as she is the one deciding the strategy for the online communication. Furthermore, she was put in charge of a taskforce during the breakout and lockdown, in which they coordinated and planned their COVID-19 strategies and procedures. The purpose of this paper is not to study how the worldwide online communication changed during the COVID-19 pandemic, but to study how nonprofit organization's online communication has changed (Kvale 2007, 43-45). Thus, the title and expertise of the Head of Communication and Organizational Development at Kræftens Bekæmpelse, Katrine Asp-Poulsen, has been found sufficient for this paper (Flick 2007, 29-30).

This interview provided the qualitative data required to analyze and interpret her constructed reality. A crucial part of this is allowing yourself to visit the constructed reality of the interviewee, a reality most likely unknown to the interviewer. In order to let the interviewee show her constructed reality, a semi-structured interview is used, which lets the interviewee take the answer in their desired direction. This structure allows the interviewer to direct the interview by using both prepared questions, as they are written and altered if found necessary in the moment, but also questions which come to mind during the interview (Bryman 2016, 468-469), such as follow-up questions, probing questions and interpreting questions (Kvale 2007, 60-63).

Although questions might be asked in a different way or might come to mind during the interview, some structure is needed in a semi-structured interview. Thus, an interview guide has been made. The interview guide begins with introductory question about the interviewee. This is done to make the interviewee feel more comfortable and get the interview started in an easy manner for the interviewee. The remaining questions are mostly open-ended and a mix of introductory questions followed by follow-up questions, probing questions, specifying questions, direct questions, indirect questions and structuring questions. Knowing when to be silent is also important for the interviewer. Sometimes during an interview, the interviewee may be silent for a period of seconds, and the interviewer might be tempted to ask a new question. However, it is important to be absolutely sure that the interviewee is finished answering the question, and here being silent for a second or two, might be enough to make the interviewee explore their reality further (Kvale 2007, 60-63). The questions were based on the thematic focus and formed by the theoretical understanding of this paper (Kvale 2007, 39), however kept brief and simple, as the interviewee was not familiar with the theoretical understanding of this paper (Kvale 2007, 60).

The interview was conducted on the telephone. Conducting a telephone interview has positives and negatives, as asking sensitive questions might be easier as the interviewee is not physically present. However, the missing physical presence of the interviewee also means that the interviewer cannot interpret the body language of the interviewee during the interview (Bryman 2016, 484-485).

The contact with Katrine Asp-Poulsen was established by writing an e-mail to Kræftens Bekæmpelse, asking for an interview for this paper. Kræftens Bekæmpelse does not list the e-mails of their employees on their website, therefore a middleman, in this case their info e-mail, was necessary. The interview was conducted on December 2, 2020 and lasted about 40 minutes. The interview was recorded using the Windows Voice Recorder, and the recording was subsequently used to transcribe the interview. The transcribing of an interview is a time-consuming process, however it allows the researcher to delve into what is being said in the interview. There are, unfortunately, some inevitable mistakes in transcribing an interview, as it is the researcher's decision how to interpret what is being said, when a half or full stop is being made, and what an indistinct word is. Thus, if two people were to transcribe the same recording, it would be different in some ways (Bryman 2016, 479-483).

The interview will be analyzed using discourse analysis based on the theory. This entails interpreting the meaning of what is being said or written. This type of analysis allows the researcher to delve into the reality of the participant as touched upon above (Bryman 2016, 531-40).

Methodology

Before introducing the nonprofit organization studied in this paper, a definition of a stakeholder and a crisis will be presented to understand the premise of the choice of nonprofit organization.

Stakeholder defined

The definition of a stakeholder in this paper will be Freeman's definition, which states: "A stakeholder in an organization is (by definition) any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives." (Freeman 1984, 46). Given the thematic purpose of this paper, the stakeholders will then be considered as being the followers of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook page as well the stakeholders identified by the Head of

Communication and Organizational Development, as they are the ones who are affected by the online communication from Kræftens Bekæmpelse.

Crisis defined

The definition of a crisis in this paper will be Coombs' definition, which states: "A crisis is the perception of an unpredictable event that threatens important expectancies of stakeholders and can seriously impact an organization's performance and generate negative outcomes." (Coombs 2012, 2). The important part of Coombs' definition is that the stakeholders are mentioned, as it is the stakeholders' perception of an organization's crisis, which defines if an organization is in a crisis. However, crises can be predicted, as the paper will touch upon later. A crisis can also violate the expectations stakeholders have towards an organization, and if the organization does not take this seriously, the crisis can be prolonged. The difference between an incident and a crisis is focused on how serious the impact is. If a beer company finds a mistake on a batch of beer and discovers a fault in the production, which is fixed quickly, it can be described as an incident. However, if the beer company finds that several batches of beer has been delivered to supermarkets, exposing stakeholders to the mistake, and that the fault in the production, means that everything must be replaced, which will stop production for two months, it can be described as a crisis. Note that in the second example the crisis affects the stakeholders (Coombs 2012, 2-4). The terrorist attack in the USA on September 11, 2001 changed the view on crises, as it showed that events in other locations could turn into a crisis for organizations. An event, such as a pandemic, can thus affect organizations, even when the organization does not hold the initial responsibility. If an organization is not ready for such a crisis, or manages it poorly, the stakeholders will be affected (Coombs 2012, 16).

Kræftens Bekæmpelse

Kræftens Bekæmpelse has been chosen as the nonprofit organization to be analyzed for this paper. Kræftens Bekæmpelse is a nonprofit organization in Denmark, with almost 700 employees and about 46,000 volunteers, working to collect funds for research, prevention, information, and support to patients (Danish Cancer Society, n.d.) Merely 3 % of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's income in 2019 came from public funds, and 80 % came from public means. This shows that they heavily rely on the public in their fight against cancer, and therefore it is essential that the public is reminded and

informed about what Kræftens Bekæmpelse does and what the funds are used for (Kræftens Bekæmpelse 2020).

In a report from September 23, 2020, the Danish Health Authority concluded, that cancer patients were at increased risk of having severe symptoms of COVID-19, if the cancer had spread, if they had been diagnosed within a year, or if they were undergoing treatment for cancer for example chemotherapy (Sundhedsstyrelsen 2020, 14). Building on the definition of a crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic is thereby seen as a crisis for Kræftens Bekæmpelse, as their stakeholders are patients and relations.

In order to delve into the reality of the nonprofit organization, only one nonprofit organization has been chosen for this paper. The intention of this paper is not to conclude how every nonprofit organization has been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, but to understand how the COVID-19 pandemic can affect and has affected a nonprofit organization. This also allows the analysis of both the Facebook posts and the interview with Asp-Poulsen, thereby creating a broader perspective on the nonprofit organization's handling of the crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Web 2.0

In the beginning of the internet, what is now called Web 1.0 was the main factor. Web 1.0 was characterized by websites and one-way communication, which gave organizations the opportunity to communicate to their stakeholders, however, not communicate with their stakeholders. Later, Web 2.0 was developed, characterized by user generated sites, where sharing content was the main object. This allowed the users to interact with each other, and thereby Web 2.0 became the foundation for social media. According to Coombs, social media has five characteristics. First, *anyone* can use social media. If you have a device with an internet connection, you can share content and comment on social media. Second, the *openness* of social media allows virtually anyone to use social media. Third, social media relies heavily on *conversation* between users. Fourth, *communities* are easily created, connecting people with shared beliefs and interests. Fifth, links to other platforms and websites are easily shared, making *connectedness* the last characteristic of social media according to Coombs. Social media can be several things, for example blogs, wikis, podcast, and forums. The social media in focus in this paper is Facebook, which is a social network, where users can share content and communicate with each other (Coombs 2012, 19-25).

Theory

In the following chapters, the theories used to analyze the data will be presented. First, the classification scheme Information, Community, and Action will be presented. This will be used to analyze and classify the posts from Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook page and determine the organizational type. Next, the crisis communication theory Three-Stage Model will be presented. This model will be used to analyze how Kræftens Bekæmpelse's online communication was affected by the crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic in Denmark. These theories will be used in the analysis of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's efforts during the COVID-19 pandemic in order to answer the problem formulation.

Information, Community and Action

In this chapter, the classification scheme used to analyze the collected data from the nonprofit organization Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook page will be presented. The classification scheme was created by Kristen Lovejoy and Gregory D. Saxton in their journal article 'Information, Community, and Action: How Nonprofit Organizations Use Social Media'. Lovejoy and Saxton themselves proposed that the classification scheme be called "'Information-Community-Action' microblogging message classification scheme." (Lovejoy & Saxton 2012, 349), and the classification scheme will therefore be mentioned as Information, Community and Action in this paper.

In Lovejoy and Saxton's beforementioned journal article they examined tweets 2,437 from a period of two weeks from 73 nonprofit organizations and found, that the tweets could be divided into three broad categories: *Information*, *Community*, and *Action*. Both the categories *Community* and *Action* has subcategories, which classifies which type of *Community* or *Action* message the tweet contains. The reason for this analysis of tweets from a wide range of nonprofit organizations, was that Lovejoy and Saxton did not find that the field of knowledge was extensive, and an analysis of organization's ways of communicating via social media to their stakeholders, was their contribution to the furtherment of the field of knowledge. The Information, Communication, and Action classification scheme could then be used to not only analyze the organization's communication to

their stakeholders, but also analyze and classify the organization itself, as the type of communication to their stakeholders would tell a lot about what kind of organization it was. For this, Lovejoy and Saxton found that there were three organizational types amongst the nonprofit organizations in their study: *Information Sources*, *Community Builders*, and *Promoters & Mobilizers*. In their analysis of the 73 nonprofit organizations' 2,437 tweets, Lovejoy and Saxton found that 58.6 % of the tweets posted were classified as *Information*, 25.8 % were classified as *Community* and 15.6 % were classified *Action*. From this, Lovejoy and Saxton could conclude that even though social media allows organizations the opportunity of having an open dialog with their stakeholders, the majority of *Information* tweets showed that this may not be an opportunity the organizations have prioritized using (Lovejoy & Saxton 2012, 337-352).

In the following section of this chapter, the three categories *Information*, *Community*, and *Action*, along with their respective subcategories, will be presented.

The first category, *Information*, is the only category of the three which does not have subcategories. Lovejoy and Saxton define *Information* as “activities, highlights from events, or any other news, facts, reports or information relevant to an organization’s stakeholders.” (Lovejoy & Saxton 2012, 343). This means that *Information* is a one-way interaction with the stakeholders, where the organization posts something they find that the stakeholders might find relevant. This can also be links to other sites, which the organization believes could be helpful or meaningful for the stakeholders. The sole purpose of this category of communication from the organization is to inform the stakeholders, however neutral information can create dialog between the stakeholders and the organization, even when it is not the purpose. “Information is a powerful tool during crises” (Lovejoy & Saxton 2012, 343) and therefore the *Information* category is very relevant for this paper, as information can assist organizations in boosting their accountability and public trust when a crisis occurs (Lovejoy & Saxton 2012, 343).

Community is the second category, and it has four subcategories: *Giving recognition and thanks*, *acknowledgement of current and local events*, *responding to public reply messages* and *response solicitation*. This category is essential in building a community for the stakeholders and creating dialogue between the stakeholders or with the organization. The first two subcategories are related to building a community for the stakeholders. This could be thanking a donor or a benefactor for their contribution and showing the other stakeholders that people are contributing to the community. Or it could be introducing the stakeholders to a charity event, where the stakeholders can meet each

other, and thereby create a community between the stakeholders. The latter two subcategories are related to creating dialogue directly with the stakeholders by either commenting on a stakeholder's mention or direct message to the organization, or by asking a question and having the stakeholders answer this question. This can be done by asking a simple, relevant or irrelevant, question or by creating a poll or a quiz. Using this type of communication to stakeholders allows the possibility to create an online community through engaging stakeholders to interact, share and converse, by applying categories, which either spark interactive conversations or ties the community together (Lovejoy & Saxton 2012, 343-345).

The final category, *Action*, focuses on getting the stakeholders to do something for the organization and it is the most direct way of making stakeholders do this. Nonprofit organizations are often relying on donations and volunteers amongst other things, and therefore it is important to be able to ask the stakeholders to help. The *Action* category consists of seven subcategories which are:

- *Promote an event*: Nonprofit organizations often arrange events such as fundraisers, charity events or community building event, and promotions of such an event can be a very efficient way of increasing participation and donations.
- *Donations appeal*: Nonprofit organizations are often reliant on donations, as mentioned, and they therefore need to ask for donations.
- *Selling a product*: Another way of getting donations can be the selling of products, where the proceeds go to the cause.
- *Call for volunteers and employees*: As mentioned earlier, nonprofit organizations can also rely on volunteers, and recruiting through social media can be a way of getting volunteers. Social media can also be used to recruit new employees.
- *Lobbying and advocacy*: If the organization find a cause worth fighting for, they can ask their stakeholders to join them in their efforts.
- *Join another site or vote for organization*: Asking stakeholders to join sites or vote for other organizations can also be a way of getting help with a cause worth fighting for.
- *Learn how to help*: Another, more indirect, way to ask for donations or volunteers is by teaching the stakeholders how to help (Lovejoy & Saxton 2012, 345-47).

This first two categories are important to make this category work, as the stakeholders need information to know what they are helping, and being part of the community helps knowing who they are helping.

By analyzing which category an organization mainly relies on, the classification scheme can then help to categorize the organization as either one of the three organizational types amongst the nonprofit organizations: *Information Source*, *Community Builder*, or *Promoter & Mobilizer*.

As mentioned, Lovejoy and Saxton created this classification scheme by analyzing data from Twitter, however they believe the classification scheme can be used on other social media platforms as well:

“We also believe the categories are generalizable to other types of social media. For example, though Facebook has a larger range of functionality, Facebook statuses and tweets are so similar that many users, including several of the organizations in our study, send out the same messages on both outlets simultaneously” (Lovejoy & Saxton 2012, 351).

Therefore, the classification scheme Information, Community, and Action will be used in this paper to analyze Facebook posts from Kræftens Bekæmpelse before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, in order to answer the problem formulation.

Three-Stage Approach

In the following chapter the crisis management theory Three-Stage Approach by W. Timothy Coombs will be presented. Drawing from theorists such as Steven Fink, Ian Mitroff, and David Sturges, Coombs developed the Three-Stage Approach, which divides a crisis into three stages: *precrisis*, *crisis event*, and *postcrisis* (Coombs 2012, 10).

Precrisis

Precrisis is, as the name suggests, the stage before a triggering event causes the crisis to erupt. At this stage, clues or hints of a crisis appear, and the organization must therefore always be alert in order to detect the clues or hints of crisis. An organization must be alert and recognize if their environment changes, both in their own organization, but also outside their organization, as the *precrisis* stage is a period for anticipating a crisis and implementing activities that can minimize the crisis (Coombs 2012, 11-12).

The Proactive Management Functions are three management functions which organizations can use to ensure a crisis will not grow too big or even prevent the crisis all together. First, Issue Management is the attempt to have an issue turn to your favor or not turn into a (big) crisis (Coombs 2012, 31-32). Here, a tool to manage a crisis is the Jones and Chase model (Jones & Chase 1979, 3-23), which consists of five steps: issue identification, issue analysis, issue change strategy option, issue action program, and evaluation. In the first two steps, the identification of the issue and the following analysis of the issue and its potential to turn into a crisis, forms the basis of the next two steps. Issue change strategy offers the organizations the option to change their strategy to prevent further damage from a crisis. Issue action focuses on communicating the organization's position to stakeholders. Here, goals and objectives for communication are developed through the identification of an issue and the analysis of said issue, followed by a plan on how, when, and where to execute them. These goals and objectives for communication are accomplished through specific messages to the stakeholders. By keeping the stakeholders informed before the crisis, an organization might be better suited for when the crisis erupts (Coombs 2012, 32-35).

Second, Reputation Management is about creating a favorable relationship to the stakeholders. Coombs defines reputation as "an evaluation stakeholders make about an organization" (Coombs 2012, 35). A favorable relationship with the stakeholders creates a good reputation, and a good reputation creates a favorable situation for the organization, as stakeholders are likely to support the organization further. According to Coombs, there are two types of stakeholders: primary and secondary. The primary stakeholders are the employees, investors, customers, suppliers, and the government, and a bad reputation with these can lead to the end of an organization with employee strikes, investors stopping their investments, customers stopping buying the organization's products or services, suppliers stopping their supplying, and the government making restrictions or laws unfavorable for the organization. The secondary stakeholders are the media, activist groups, and competitors. A bad reputation with these can lead to damage of the organization. Note that a bad reputation with the primary stakeholders can lead to the end of an organization, and a bad reputation with the secondary stakeholders can lead to damage of the organization. However, this does not mean an organization should only focus on its primary stakeholders, as these can be affected by the secondary stakeholders' relationship to the organizations. Therefore, it is important to communicate to both the primary and secondary stakeholders, in order to uphold a good reputation (Coombs 2012, 35-40).

Third, Risk Management is about finding internal risks in the organization, which possibly could create a crisis. However, this Proactive Management Function has not been found important for this paper, as Risk Management focuses on risks such as safer production, which is not relevant concerning nonprofit organization in a pandemic (Coombs 2012, 40-43).

Finally, it is important to note, that all the Proactive Management Functions are connected as Issue Management might become easier if the Reputation Management is done correctly and vice versa. Therefore, it is important that an organization works with the Proactive Management Functions, which are relevant for them, in order to minimize a potential crisis (Coombs 2012, 43-44).

When working with social media in the *precrisis*, listening is a central part of handling the crisis at hand. The organization must always be alert on their social media and aware of what the stakeholders post. Although there is a vast number of posts and interactions on social media, only one stakeholder's post is enough to create a crisis for an organization. Given that essentially anyone can use social media, anyone can go viral and create a crisis. However, it must be noted, that very few posts have the potential to go viral and create a crisis, which is both reassuring and stressing for the organizations, as the risk is small, but the scanning for crisis is difficult and demands a considerable amount of work (Coombs 2012, 25-27).

Crisis Event

In the *crisis event* stage, the triggering event has now happened, and the crisis has erupted. If prepared, the organization has used the Proactive Management Functions to identify the issue, planned how to handle it, and had a good relationship with the stakeholders. This stage is used to manage the crisis, and make sure it does not cause more damage than avoidable. Communication to the stakeholders is essential, and one must differentiate between the 'form' and the 'content' of the communication. Form is how the communication should be presented, and focuses on a quick response, speaking with one voice, and being open. Content is what is said, and focuses on instructing information, adjusting information, and reputation management (Coombs 2012, 12 & 139).

Form of the communication

The organization needs to be quick when the crisis has erupted, because the stakeholders should not learn about the crisis from the media. Being the ones to deliver the communication and the responses creates trust and credibility in the organization, as it shows that the crisis is under control. And, opposite to that, if the organization does not communicate quickly about the crisis to the stakeholders, it shows that the crisis is not under control, and rumors and untruths might be created, thereby damaging the organization. A quick response might sometimes come at a cost, as the organization might not have the right information yet. However, a rapid response is better than being silent. It must not be an ambition to lie to the stakeholder, so if a question is asked or a topic needs to be touched upon, and the organization does not have the information yet, saying that further information on that specific topic will come, again, is better than silence. When a crisis erupts, an information void is created, and this void needs to be filled. Therefore, filling out this information void with something, is better than waiting, and leaving the information void to be filled out by others (Coombs 2012, 140-143).

Speaking with one voice is also important to create and maintain trust and credibility with the stakeholders. The stakeholders need accurate and consistent information from the organization, in order to get through the crisis, and to maintain their trust in the organization. Speaking with one voice should not be confused with only one person speaking on behalf of the organization, or one person writing the communication to the stakeholders. Using more than one employee to communicate to the stakeholders can even strengthen the trust and credibility with the stakeholders, as it shows an organization, which has the same opinions on the topics in question. Therefore, it is important that all employees are kept informed, in order to create this unity (Coombs 2012, 143-144).

Being open is about being available, willing to disclose information, and honest. As mentioned, an information void is created when a crisis erupts, and a part of filling this void is being available for the stakeholders. Being concerned for themselves, their families, or even the organization, the stakeholders need to be kept informed and reassured that the organization will handle the crisis. The use of social media is very helpful when speaking about availability, as the stakeholders can communicate with the organization through posts or event direct messaging. Another way social media is helpful, is that the organization easily can share new information directly with the stakeholders. It is important that the organization keeps the stakeholders informed with as much

information as required, however the organization must not communicate too much. Limited disclosure is the thought that the stakeholders need most of the information the organization has, but not all of it. This should not be considered deception, but a way of ensuring that the stakeholders do not panic. Limited disclosure is one of the most difficult parts of a crisis, as the organization itself must decide, what should be shared and what should not. However, if the information concerns the death of a stakeholder or the potential death of stakeholders, the organization should always share the information. Neither does limited disclosure mean that the organization should alter the truth, as lying always damages the organization. The ones lying are not credible, and if the stakeholders learn that the organization has lied to them, the organization's reputation will be difficult to repair (Coombs 2012, 144-146).

Content of the communication

The organization in crisis needs to be clear in what they communicate to the stakeholders, as both are vulnerable at the time of the crisis event. In the beginning of the *crisis event*, it is important for the organization to use *instructing information*, as the stakeholders need to know if they should do something (Sturges 1994, 308-311). *Instructing information* focuses on telling people what to do, and how the crisis affects them. An example of *instructing information* would be if drinking water were polluted in a city, and the waterwork issued a statement telling people in the affected area not to drink the water. In this case the stakeholder would then know how to act. This is something that satisfies the stakeholders, as the organization shows control of the crisis, which is crucial for the organization to uphold their credibility and reputation. As mentioned, it is important to be quick in the beginning of the crisis, and therefore it is important for the organization to know where to communicate to the stakeholder. If the stakeholders are mostly on the organization's social media platforms, the *instructing information* should be posted there. However, if the stakeholders are not on social media, the news or the website could be other options (Coombs 2012, 146-148).

After the immediate eruption of the crisis, the stakeholders will not be satisfied with just being told what to do – they will want to know the details of the crisis. Therefore, *adjusting information* focuses on communicating the what, when, where, why and how of the crisis to the stakeholders (Coombs 2012, 148-152). The organization will benefit from telling the stakeholders what they are doing to fix the crisis, but also explain why the crisis happened, as this will help the stakeholders cope with the magnitude of the crisis (Sturges 1994, 308-311).

It is crucial for an organization to focus intensely on the communication when the crisis erupts, however communication is also needed throughout the crisis, and therefore follow-up communication is important, for the organization to get out of the crisis with a good reputation. This type of communication can be targeted at individual stakeholders, addressing their concerns. As mentioned, it is important to use the media where the stakeholders are present, and social media create a good opportunity for an organization to do this. In the period of the crisis event where follow-up communication is needed, focus can also be on answering inquiries from stakeholders and tracking social media for rumors. This shows the stakeholders that the organization is working on ending the crisis or helping the stakeholders manage the crisis. If the organization in crisis has not been able to answer or address a question or topic when the crisis erupted, as mentioned previously, this period is also the time to address this. If the organization does not answer or address the question or topic unanswered from the beginning of the crisis, they will lose credibility and reputation. Lastly, it is also vital for the organization to show compassion for the stakeholders, as the organization otherwise might seem apathetic, and thereby also lose credibility and reputation (Coombs 2012, 165-167).

Social Media

Coombs argues that basic rules must be kept top of mind when working with social media in crises. First, Coombs finds that being present is crucial for an organization during a crisis. This involves being visible on social media, even if the stakeholders do not favor the organization at that moment. The stakeholders will look to the organization's social media for information during the crisis, and if the organization is not present, i.e. have posted or responded to comments in some time, the organization will be criticized by the stakeholders for hiding or ignoring the crisis and the stakeholders, severely damaging their reputation. Second, being where the action is involves analyzing where the crisis began and addressing the crisis where it is found to have begun. If the crisis has not erupted on a specific social media, another part of being where the action is, is knowing the stakeholders and knowing where they are most likely to be seeking information during the crisis. Third, being there before the crisis involves having an existing presence before the crisis has erupted. If the organization has not been active over a long period of time on a specific social media before a crisis erupts, there is a risk that the stakeholders will not look to that specific social media, if the organization decides to communicate there during the crisis. Thus, it is essential for

the organization always to keep a certain level of presence on their social media (Coombs 2012, 27-28).

Historically, news media have been used to deliver crisis communication, however by using the news media, there is the risk that they can be critical, which an organization in crisis does not need. The use of social media allows an organization to deliver their message, without a news media's critical eyes to read it first. Social media is audience driven. This means that if a social media has no or little audience, an organization does not favor from communicating on that specific social media. An organization must communicate on the social media where their stakeholders are present. Social media have become a natural part of the day in recent years, and many go to social media for information or news. Therefore, it is crucial for an organization to know where their stakeholders are looking for information and news, and to be present there (Coombs 2012, 163-165).

Postcrisis

Whether a crisis has passed into the *postcrisis* phase is decided by the crisis team in the organization in crisis. When the initial follow-up communication has finished, an investigation can be started to find the cause of the crisis and an evaluation of how the crisis was handled can begin, thus starting the *postcrisis* phase (Coombs 2012, 169-84).

As the COVID-19 pandemic is still affecting Denmark greatly, as this paper is written, the third stage *postcrisis* will not be analyzed, as it is believed the *crisis event* has not yet surpassed. The *postcrisis* could be considered beginning when a vaccine is available, and the majority of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's stakeholders are considered immune.

Analysis

In this chapter, the two sets of data will be analyzed, using the classification scheme and theory presented in the previous chapter, in order to answer the problem formulation. First, the data from Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook posts will be classified and interpreted using the Information, Community, and Action classification scheme. Then, the interview with Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Head of Communication and Organizational Development, Katrine Asp-Poulsen, will be analyzed and interpreted using the Three-Stage Approach.

Facebook posts of Kræftens Bekæmpelse

In this part of the analysis the Facebook posts from Kræftens Bekæmpelse will be classified and interpreted, followed by a classification and interpretation of the organizational type based on the post classifications from each year. This will be done chronologically, thereby beginning with the posts from 2019. When both sets of data are classified and interpreted, the two will be compared, in order to answer the problem formulation.

Facebook posts from before the COVID-19 pandemic

Kræftens Bekæmpelse use the funds they collect for cancer research and cancer treatment, and therefore they post about findings and news concerning cancer and cancer related issues. Of the 55 posts from March 11 to April 11, nine of the posts were categorized as *Information*. This corresponds to about 16 % of all the posts from this period and shows, that while this category might not be the most focused upon, it is still important for Kræftens Bekæmpelse, as this means, that they post more than three per week on their Facebook page. The posts found to be in this category focused on new cancer research and stories from stakeholders and solely focused on informing the stakeholders. Another characteristic in these posts is, that the posts focused on one-way interaction, which differentiated them from the remaining posts (Appendix 2, Information). An example of these posts could be:

“It is amazing that the HPV vaccine will be offered for free to boys who turn 12 years after July 1st

✋✋✋✋ But Kræftens Bekæmpelse believes that boys and girls should be offered equal opportunities for vaccination! Boys who are older than 12 on July 1st should also be offered the HPV vaccine for free until they turn 18 years old – just like girls” (Appendix 2, Information.

Translated by author).

Here, Kræftens Bekæmpelse informs their stakeholders that a vaccine, which prevents some types of cancer, will be available for potential stakeholders. While the post concerns a cause Kræftens Bekæmpelse advocates for, the post is not considered belonging to the category *Lobbying or advocacy* as the post does not try to make the stakeholder do something. Had the post for example contained a link to a website, where stakeholders could vote on a proposition concerning the vaccine, this would have been considered *Lobbying or advocacy*, however this post solely informs on the vaccine and Kræftens Bekæmpelse's opinion on the matter, thus being categorized as *Information*.

Community building is an important part of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's online communication strategy, which also will be further touched upon in the analysis of the interview, and thus, the number of posts in the *Community* category is 18 (Appendix 2, Community). This shows that Kræftens Bekæmpelse focuses on creating a community and maintaining the community on Facebook.

Six posts are in the subcategory *Giving recognition and thanks*, which corresponds to about 11 % of the posts from the chose period. The posts considered to be in this category focused on thanking stakeholders and wishing them well before the nationwide fundraiser (Appendix 2, Community).

Using this category in their online communication helps Kræftens Bekæmpelse create and maintain their community on Facebook, as they acknowledge their stakeholders' efforts and achievements.

An example of these posts could be: “Thank you so much for showing the flag Denmark ♥♥♥ It is a spectacular result!!! 🍷” (Appendix 2, Giving recognition and thanks. Translated by author). Here Kræftens Bekæmpelse directly thanks the stakeholders for collecting a large amount of money in their nationwide fundraiser.

16 posts are in the subcategory *Response solicitation*, which corresponds to about 29 % of the posts from the chosen period (Appendix 2, Response solicitation). Posts focusing on asking questions or getting the stakeholders to share a post were classified as belonging in this category. Again, some of the posts could be classified otherwise, for example as *Information*, however if the post contained a

form of dialogue creating communication it would be classified as *Response solicitation*. An example of these posts could be: “We are so excited to hear all your stories from the routes! 🙌 What was the best thing about being a collector today? Share it with us in the comment box ❤️👉” (Appendix 2, Response solicitation. Translated by author). In this example, Kræftens Bekæmpelse directly asks the stakeholders to comment in the comment box, thereby soliciting a response from the stakeholders.

The *Action* category is the most represented category in the chosen period (Appendix 2, Action), however only the subcategory *Call for volunteers and employees* is focused on intensely, as *Promote an event* are used two times. Therefore, representing only 4 %, it cannot be argued that this is a focus in Kræftens Bekæmpelse’s online communication in the chosen period. The two *Promote an event* posts focus on promoting a challenge concerning health and promoting the nationwide fundraiser. Similar posts have been categorized otherwise, however as neither of these posts tries to create community or solely inform, they are categorized as *Promote an event* (Appendix 2, Promote an event). An example of these posts could be:

“Good morning dear collectors! 🐼 We start in a few hours. We hope you are ready? 🏃🏃🏃 Remember that there are still routes if you did not yet enroll. You can just show up at a fundraising site near you, then we will find a route for you. Find the meeting sites here www.cancer.dk/fb/find_indsamlingssted/ Have an amazing day!” (Appendix 2, Promote an event. Translated by author).

Kræftens Bekæmpelse heavily relies on public means, as about 80 % of their annual income comes from fundraising and donations (Kræftens Bekæmpelse 2020). This can also be seen in their online communication, as 22 of the posts are classified as *Call for volunteers and employees*. This corresponds to 40 % of the posts from the chosen period (Appendix 2, Call for volunteers and employees) and shows, that Kræftens Bekæmpelse’s focus here is to recruit as many volunteers as possible to their upcoming nationwide fundraiser, which was held on April 7, 2019. Posts containing requests for enlisting as a collector, were classified as belonging in this category. Some of the posts classified as *Call for volunteers and employees* could also have been classified as for example *Information* or *Promote an event*. However, because the posts contain and often end with calling for volunteers for the nationwide fundraiser, they were classified as *Call for volunteers and employees*. An example of these posts could be: “On Sunday April 7th all of Denmark shows the flag at the nationwide fundraiser and your help makes a difference ❤️ Are you joining? You can

EXPLORING COVID-19'S EFFECT ON NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS' ONLINE COMMUNICATION

enroll as a collector here: http://www.cancer.dk/fb/danmark_viser_flaget/” (Appendix 2, Call for volunteers and employees. Translated by author). Here the date of the event is communicated to the stakeholders, which could classify this post as a *Promote an event* post, however as the post ends with a call for volunteers to enroll as a collector it is classified as a *Call for volunteers and employees* post.

The categories *Acknowledgement of current & local events*, *Response to public reply messages*, *Donation appeal*, *Selling a product*, *Lobbying and advocacy*, *Join another site or vote for organization*, and *Learn how to help* was not found to be represented in the 55 posts. This does not mean that Kræftens Bekæmpelse do not use these categories, however in this period they do not use these in their online communication.

On the basis of the online communication from March 11, 2019 to April 11, 2019, Kræftens Bekæmpelse can be categorized as a *Community Builder* and *Promoter & Mobilizer*. This should be seen mainly in the light of their nationwide fundraiser on April 7, as Kræftens Bekæmpelse needs volunteers for this. Thus, *Action* is the most used category in their Facebook posts representing about 44 % of the posts (Appendix 2, Action). As the *Community* category is represented with 40 % of the posts from the period, Kræftens Bekæmpelse’s community building strategy is evident (Appendix 2, Community).

Facebook posts 2019		
Category	Number of posts	% of posts
Information	9	16,3636364 %
Giving recognition and thanks	6	10,9090909 %
Response solicitation	16	29,0909091 %
Promote an event	2	3,63636364 %
Call for volunteers and employees	22	40 %
Total	55	100 %

Table 1

Facebook posts from during the COVID-19 pandemic

Of the 53 post from Kræftens Bekæmpelse’s Facebook page during the period March 11 to April 11, 2020, 28 of them were categorized as *Information*. This corresponds to about 53 % of the posts (Appendix 3, Information) and shows that Kræftens Bekæmpelse had increased their focus on

informing their stakeholders in this period. The posts focus on new research, stories from and about stakeholders, and information concerning COVID-19, and contained only one-way interaction with the stakeholders. The increased focus on this category can be explained by the need to inform and support the stakeholders about the procedures concerning the COVID-19 pandemic, as they are more vulnerable than people in good health. An example on one of these posts could be:

“The corona pandemic has forced all of us into isolation. But that feeling is not new for Liff Olivia Bytov. Her 8-year-old son Julius has leukemia. For the second time. This means, that the family for several years has lived more or less isolated” (Appendix 3, Information. Translated by author).

Here, Kræftens Bekæmpelse reports the story of a family, that has lived in isolation for many years, and thereby inform the stakeholders, that some cancer patients have lived in isolation, not just in a lockdown, but for several years of their lives. Thus, by informing the stakeholders about the vulnerable patients and relations affected by cancer, Kræftens Bekæmpelse shows their followers, that some people are more vulnerable during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the *Community* category, Kræftens Bekæmpelse was found to have 22 posts in the chosen period. This corresponds to about 41 % of the posts (Appendix 3, Community), thereby maintaining the focus on this category, as 40 % of the posts from the same period the year before were categorized as *Community*.

Six of the posts from the chosen period were categorized as belonging to the subcategory *Giving recognition and thanks*, corresponding to about 11 % of the posts (Appendix 3, Giving recognition and thanks). Kræftens Bekæmpelse has the same amount of focus on this subcategory as the same period the year before. These posts consist of recognition of stakeholders' achievements and thanking stakeholders. Some of the posts could have been categorized as *Information*, however as they contain a direct acknowledgement or thanks to the stakeholders, they were categorized as *Giving recognition and thanks*. An example of these post could be: “Thank you! ♥ We would like to send a huge THANK YOU to everybody, who makes an effort to protect the elderly and vulnerable – including cancer patients. Your work makes a gigantic difference! 🙌” (Appendix 3, Giving recognition and thanks. Translated by author). In this post, Kræftens Bekæmpelse thanks their stakeholders directly, thereby building on their community by creating a sense of unity and community spirit.

16 posts were categorized as *Response solicitation*, which corresponds to 30 % of the posts from the chosen period (Appendix 3, Response solicitation). Again, Kræftens Bekæmpelse has about the

same number of posts in this category as the same period the year before. These posts contained dialog creating content in the form of either a question, a suggestion to post a comment or a suggestion to share the post. By creating this type of dialog with the stakeholders, Kræftens Bekæmpelse creates or builds on their community on Facebook. One of the posts could have been categorized as *Acknowledgement of current and local events*, as it focused on Easter, however as the post also contained a suggestion to write an easter greeting in the comment box, this too was categorized as *Response solicitation*. An example of one of the posts in the subcategory *Response solicitation* could be:

“💡 JOINT BRAINSTORM 💡 Share your idea for an activity to do at home – for the benefit for all who is looking. In this time, we must take care of each other and spend as much time at home as possible. Especially cancer patients are extra vulnerable. We will begin with a couple of bids in the commentary box – now it is your turn! 😊” (Appendix 3, Response solicitation. Translated by author).

Here, Kræftens Bekæmpelse asks their stakeholders to comment in the comment box thereby creating a dialog with and between the stakeholders, again building on the community.

Three posts were categorized as the *Action* category, one post in the subcategory *Promote an event* and two in the subcategory *Call for volunteers and employees*, corresponding to about 2 % and 4 % of the posts in the chosen period, respectively (Appendix 3, Action). This is a significantly decreased focus, as 44 % of the post from the same period the year before was found to be in the category *Action*. Especially the subcategory *Call for volunteers and employees* has decreased considerably, as the percentage of these posts has reduced about 36 %. This decrease is caused by the nationwide fundraiser being cancelled and postponed to a later date because of the COVID-19 pandemic, thereby moving the need for recruiting volunteers. The two posts categorized as *Call for volunteers and employees* both contained a suggestion to enroll and a link to the enrolling website, thereby containing a suggestion for the stakeholders to do an action by enrolling. An example of one of the posts could be: “SPREAD THE NEWS: The nationwide fundraiser is held on August 16! 🌀 We are looking forward to it - are you? Enroll as collector here: <http://cancer.dk/fb/nydato/>” (Appendix 3, Call for volunteers and employees. Translated by author). In this post Kræftens Bekæmpelse informs the stakeholders about the postponed nationwide fundraiser and suggests the action of enrolling as a fundraising collector. This post could have been categorized as *Promote an event*, however as it contains a suggestion and a link to enroll as a fundraising collector, the post has

been categorized as *Call for volunteers and employees*. The post found to be in the subcategory *Promote an event* did not concern the nationwide fundraiser, as it promoted social media takeovers, informing the stakeholders about the time of the several takeovers.

The categories *Acknowledgement of current & local events*, *Response to public reply messages*, *Donation appeal*, *Selling a product*, *Lobbying and advocacy*, *Join another site or vote for organization*, and *Learn how to help* were not found to be represented in the 53 posts. This does not mean that Kræftens Bekæmpelse does not use these categories, however in this period they do not use these in their online communication, as in the same period in the year before.

On the basis of the online communication from March 11, 2020 to April 11, 2020, Kræftens Bekæmpelse can be categorized as an *Information Source* and *Community Builder*. This should be seen mainly in the light of the need to inform the stakeholders about the COVID-19 pandemic, as Kræftens Bekæmpelse's stakeholder are extra vulnerable to the virus. By relying on *Information* Kræftens Bekæmpelse boosts their accountability and public trust in the crisis. Thus, *Information* is the most used category in their Facebook posts representing about 53 % of the posts (Appendix 3, Information). As the *Community* category is represented with 41 % of the posts from the period (Appendix 3, Community), Kræftens Bekæmpelse's community building strategy can be considered as permanent.

Facebook posts 2020		
Category	Number of posts	% of posts
Information	28	52,8301887 %
Giving recognition and thanks	6	11,3207547 %
Response solicitation	16	30,1886792 %
Promote an event	1	1,88679245 %
Call for volunteers and employees	2	3,77358491 %
Total	53	100 %

Table 2

Comparison of posts before and during COVID-19 pandemic

Based on the results of the categorization of Facebook posts from Kræftens Bekæmpelse in the periods March 11 to April 11, 2019 and March 11 to April 11, 2020 the following differences and similarities have been found.

EXPLORING COVID-19'S EFFECT ON NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS' ONLINE COMMUNICATION

In the chosen period from 2019, Kræftens Bekæmpelse was found to be the organizational type *Promoter & Mobilizer*, because of their focus on recruiting volunteers for their nationwide fundraiser. A period in which they had significantly less focus on *Information*. In the chosen period from 2020, Kræftens Bekæmpelse shifted their focus from recruiting volunteers to informing their stakeholders, as they were found to be the organizational type *Information Source*, because of the need to inform stakeholders about the COVID-19 pandemic. Another reason for the shift in organizational type, was that the nationwide fundraiser Kræftens Bekæmpelse recruited volunteers for in 2019, was cancelled and postponed in 2020, moving the task of recruiting volunteers to a later period. As seen in table 3, the percentage of *Call for volunteers and employees* posts in 2019 were about 36 % higher than in 2020, and the percentage of *Information* posts in 2020 were about 36 % higher in than in 2019. This shows that Kræftens Bekæmpelse's focus on recruiting stakeholders for their nationwide fundraiser, was not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, as this was replaced by informing stakeholders about the virus and its effects on cancer patients.

In the chosen period from 2019 and 2020, Kræftens Bekæmpelse was also found to be the organizational type *Community Builder*, as they had a significant focus on *Response solicitation* in both periods. This shows that Kræftens Bekæmpelse's focus on building and maintaining an online community for their stakeholders, was not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, as the change in percentage from 2019 to 2020 was about 1.5 % as seen in table 3.

Furthermore, the same categories were used in both periods, as Kræftens Bekæmpelse refrained from using the categories *Acknowledgement of current & local events*, *Response to public reply messages*, *Donation appeal*, *Selling a product*, *Lobbying and advocacy*, *Join another site or vote for organization*, and *Learn how to help* in both the periods from 2019 and 2020. Again, this does not entail that Kræftens Bekæmpelse does not use these categories in other periods, however the selection of categories was not found to be affected by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Facebook posts 2019 & 2020			
Category	% of posts 2019	% of posts 2020	Difference
Information	16,3636364 %	52,8301887 %	36,4665523
Giving recognition and thanks	10,9090909 %	11,3207547 %	0,4116638
Response solicitation	29,0909091 %	30,1886792 %	1,0977701
Promote an event	3,63636364 %	1,88679245 %	-1,74957119
Call for volunteers and employees	40 %	3,77358491 %	-36,2264151
Total	100%	100 %	0 %

Table 3

Crisis communication interview

The analysis will follow the structure of the Three-Stage Approach theory presented in the previous chapter. Thus, Kræftens Bekæmpelse's COVID-19 crisis will be analyzed and interpreted focusing on the Proactive Management Functions first, followed by an analysis and interpretation of the form and content of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's communication, along with the social media efforts during their crisis. This is done in order to study the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on Kræftens Bekæmpelse's online communication.

First, Katrine Asp-Poulsen states in the interview that the crisis has been both a crisis for the stakeholders and for the organization when she says: "It has been a crisis for cancer patients and relations" (Appendix 1, 35:18. Translated by author) and "It has in reality also been a crisis for Kræftens Bekæmpelse as an association, in that we have had to cancel numerous fundraising activities" (Appendix 1, 35:57. Translated by author). This matches the definition of a crisis used in the beginning of this paper, and therefore the assumption that the COVID-19 pandemic has been a crisis for Kræftens Bekæmpelse is maintained.

Proactive Management Functions

As stated in the theory chapter, the precrisis phase is the phase before a triggering event erupts the crisis, however practically the borders between the precrisis and the crisis event are fluid and are determined by the actors of the crisis. Katrine Asp-Poulsen states: "As early as in the beginning of March, we are becoming aware, that here is something we need to keep an eye on" (Appendix 1, 6:02. Translated by author). This shows that according to the Jones and Chase model, Kræftens Bekæmpelse began their *issue identification* and *issue analysis* in the beginning of March 2020. The first Dane was tested positive for COVID-19 on February 28th, 2020 (Statens Serum Institut 2020), and although COVID-19 was already widely spread in the world, WHO had not yet declared it a pandemic (WHO/Europe 2020). In spite of the fact that Kræftens Bekæmpelse could have begun their *issue identification* and *issue analysis* before, they are not too late, as the crisis event had not yet begun. Had Kræftens Bekæmpelse not begun their *issue identification* and *issue analysis* before the lockdown on March 11th, 2020, this could have been considered too late, and the crisis could have turned out worse for them, as they might not have been ready to support their stakeholders.

Looking at the *issue change strategy options* Kræftens Bekæmpelse used, it is clear, that when dealing with a nonprofit organization, which does not produce and sell product as their main business, unusual changes must be made. One of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's main focuses is to support patients and relations, and one of their ways of doing so is their telephone line 'Kræftlinjen', where employees support the ones calling. Kræftens Bekæmpelse used an *issue change strategy option* by sending most of their employees home to work from home as Asp-Poulsen states: "On March 12th we sent as many home to work from home as physically possible" (Appendix 1, 12:53. Translated by author). If Kræftens Bekæmpelse had had an outbreak of COVID-19 within their employees, their services would have been affected. However, they avoided this by changing their procedures, and made sure the crisis did not affect them on this issue.

Another of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's main focuses is to raise funds for cancer research, support, and information. As mentioned, Kræftens Bekæmpelse only get 3 % of their funds from the government, so their fundraising activities are crucial. The nationwide fundraiser, where volunteers go door to door to raise money for Kræftens Bekæmpelse, is one of the largest in Denmark as Asp-Poulsen states: "I believe it is Denmark's biggest nationwide fundraiser, when we come from Kræftens Bekæmpelse" (Appendix 1, 15:00. Translated by author). However, in a time where a global pandemic rages, sending volunteers door to door and possibly infect or be infected, would create a bigger crisis for Kræftens Bekæmpelse, as they would be the ones spreading the contagious disease in the Danish population. Thus, they had to use an *issue change strategy option* and first cancel the nationwide fundraiser, and then postpone it several times as Asp-Poulsen states: "Our nationwide fundraiser, which should have been (...) in the end of March, we had to cancel and postpone, to begin with to June, and the postpone once again to August" (Appendix 1, 12:53. Translated by author).

The cancellation and postponement of the fundraiser meant, that Kræftens Bekæmpelse lost a substantial amount of funds, however they did not contribute to the infection in the Danish population by going door to door and spreading the disease, thus lessening the crisis' impact on Kræftens Bekæmpelse. However, they did not miss out on all the funds they could have raised, as they moved the fundraising to their Facebook page, where their stakeholders could make their own fundraisers, and people could then donate online. "Fortunately, we were approved a few weeks before the nationwide fundraiser, so it has been a massive change" (Appendix 1, 15:00. Translated by author). This statement shows that this was also part of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's *issue change strategy*, as this was planned before the crisis event to have an alternative to the nationwide

fundraiser. This turned out to be a favorable decision as Kræftens Bekæmpelse later could host both the physical nationwide fundraiser and the online fundraisers.

The other option in the Jones and Chase model is *issue action program*, where the crisis manager(s) develops goals and objectives for communication followed by a plan on how, when, and where to execute them. Again, this is done to prepare the stakeholders for the crisis event, and thereby lessen the crisis. As mentioned earlier in this paper, Asp-Poulsen was put in charge of a taskforce during the breakout and lockdown, in which they coordinated and planned their COVID-19 strategies and procedures. Thus, where the *issue action program* was made. The goals and objectives became clear for Kræftens Bekæmpelse as Asp-Poulsen states: "So there just was a need to say something clear, to say what does one do in this situation" (Appendix 1, 6:59. Translated by author). As mentioned, one of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's main focuses is to support patients and relations during their illness, and this too was their priority during the COVID-19 pandemic. In order to lessen the crisis for their stakeholders, and thereby lessen the crisis for themselves, Kræftens Bekæmpelse sought to answer the questions, their stakeholders had about having cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic and thereby support them. "And there we simply build a site with Q&As. We wrote down the questions we met on social media and we met on Kræftlinjen" (Appendix 1, 6:59. Translated by author). This statement by Asp-Poulsen shows the 'how' and 'where' of their *issue action program* as, they found that they needed to write down the questions they received and post them on their website. About the 'when' Asp-Poulsen states: "In a matter of the first days we had a site, an actual corona site" (Appendix 1, 6:59. Translated by author), which shows that in a matter of days they would be able to post on the website, and thereby lessen the impact of the crisis.

The second Proactive Management Function, *Reputation Management*, focuses on the reputation the organization has amongst their stakeholders, as the name suggests. First, it is important to know who the *primary* and *secondary stakeholders* are, in order to know who to focus on during a crisis. For Kræftens Bekæmpelse the *primary stakeholders* are the patients and relations as Asp-Poulsen states: "It is definitely the patients and relations" (Appendix 1, 2:59. Translated by author). Given Kræftens Bekæmpelse's primary focuses on support and information to cancer patients and relations, the intense focus on this type of stakeholders is reasonable and given that Kræftens Bekæmpelse has analyzed that most of the visitors on their website, cancer.dk, are patients and relations as Asp-Poulsen states: "3/4 of our users on cancer.dk are patients and relations" (Appendix 1, 3:04. Translated by author), the focus on these stakeholders is justifiable. However, as mentioned

in the theory chapter, the *primary stakeholders* can be many types of stakeholders, and not just the ‘customers’. The *primary stakeholders* can also be employees, investors, and suppliers. Therefore, when Kræftens Bekæmpelse sent their employees home during the lockdown, they managed their reputation with their stakeholders. If the employees had been forced to stay in their workplaces and had been infected, Kræftens Bekæmpelse’s reputation amongst the employees would have been poor. Furthermore, Kræftens Bekæmpelse also tended to their reputation with a *primary stakeholder* when they advised the authorities in the beginning of the crisis, as Asp-Poulsen states: “And we were also called in to meetings with the authorities about, that is in the first period, (...) saying how do we manage the pressure that we can see is coming from the health services” (Appendix 1, 32:18. Translated by author). However, it was not found that Kræftens Bekæmpelse directly focused on other *primary stakeholders* than patients and relations.

A bad relationship with the stakeholders, *primary* and *secondary*, can be damaging to an organization. Therefore, it is important to know how the stakeholders feel about the organization. This can be done in numerous ways, such as surveys and listening, and by doing so, the organization knows if somethings needs to change. Kræftens Bekæmpelse does both surveys on their website and listens, and the survey on their website shows a favorable reputation with the *primary stakeholders* as Asp-Poulsen states: “On our website we get almost North Korean satisfaction surveys” (Appendix 1, 4:12. Translated by author). An important factor when the primary focus is to support and inform patients and relations is that the support and information is easily accessible, and thus a positive website survey can be interpreted as a good reputation amongst the *primary stakeholders*, Kræftens Bekæmpelse focuses on. Kræftens Bekæmpelse also listens on their social media, where their efforts on building communities has helped them in dealing with critical users as Asp-Poulsen states: “There are quite a lot in our communities who step in to help us take the arguments with some of those who are very critical towards Kræftens Bekæmpelse” (Appendix 1, 4:12. Translated by author). The fact that the stakeholders stand up for Kræftens Bekæmpelse on social media, when someone is being critical, shows that their relationship with their stakeholders on social media is good. Kræftens Bekæmpelse tries to engage with stakeholders, which will be touched upon later, so their focus does not seem to be on taking advantage of this social media vigilance amongst their stakeholders, however if the stakeholders takes the side of Kræftens Bekæmpelse, it can be interpreted that their relationships are good.

One of the *secondary stakeholders* is the media, and maintaining a good reputation with them, can mean a better relationship with the *primary stakeholders*. However, it was not found that Kræftens

Bekæmpelse focused on actively maintaining a good reputation with the media as Asp-Poulsen states: “We answered questions when we were asked of course, but it was not a massive press effort” (Appendix 1, 12:26. Translated by author). This could be because Kræftens Bekæmpelse already has a good relationship with the *primary stakeholders*, however as mentioned, an unfavorable reputation with the *secondary stakeholders* can lead to a decline in reputation with the *primary stakeholders*, as a negative story might lead to a change of opinion of a patient.

An important part of noticing, and hopefully lessening, a crisis is *listening*. Kræftens Bekæmpelse listens to their communities on social media as touched upon, however they listen in other ways as well. First, Kræftens Bekæmpelse uses a listening program called Falcon, which contains all their posts, so the employees can answer and assign answers to the users. Most often the main task is to acknowledge the user's engagement, however the most important task is to notice the ones in need of support as Asp-Poulsen states: “And then there are the ones who need help, they are the very first we have focus on prioritizing and making contact to right?” (Appendix 1, 27:35. Translated by author). A crisis is heavily dependent on the stakeholders, and therefore having a listening program, like Falcon, is crucial in noticing when stakeholders are vulnerable in the vast amount of posts and interactions on social media, as their vulnerability can worsen a crisis.

Kræftens Bekæmpelse also listened on other media than social media as Asp-Poulsen states: “There were also people who emailed us, people who called us on Kræftlinjen and so on” (Appendix 1, 10:23. Translated by author). This stream of information was used as the basis of what would become the Q&A site previously mentioned, and Kræftens Bekæmpelse used this information to guide their doings in the crisis as Asp-Poulsen states: “What comes from the authorities, what do we hear from our own channels, what do we do in light of this” (Appendix 1, 10:23. Translated by author). By giving the stakeholders such great opportunity to communicate with the organization through multiple channels, Kræftens Bekæmpelse is granted the opportunity to know what their stakeholders' worries and thoughts are, and thereby the opportunity to avoid or, in this case, lessen the crisis. Given the importance of stakeholders when dealing with crises, this can be considered a favorable decision.

The Proactive Management Functions are used to lessen a crisis, and therefore identifying and analyzing the crisis as early as possible is crucial. Kræftens Bekæmpelse was not too late in identifying and analyzing the COVID-19 pandemic crisis, however they were not well in advance either, as the pandemic was already widespread in the world. They both sent most of their

employees home to work from home and cancelled and postponed their nationwide fundraiser as part of their *issue change strategy*, something that led them to begin using Facebook donations instead. Kræftens Bekæmpelse's *issue action strategy* focused on answering questions they found to be relevant for their stakeholders by listening on social media but also on email and telephone. Furthermore, it was found that Kræftens Bekæmpelse focused heavily on patients and relations as their *primary stakeholders*, however at the same time tending to their other stakeholders. Kræftens Bekæmpelse was not found to have focus on the media, which could be explained by their heavy focus on patients and relations, however not recommended.

Form and content of communication

As touched upon in the previous chapter, the first focus Kræftens Bekæmpelse had on communication to their stakeholders was answering their questions, and thereby supporting them in the COVID-19 pandemic. Kræftens Bekæmpelse did this by building a Q&A site on their website, which they could refer stakeholders to. When a crisis erupts, the stakeholders will need information about the crisis, and therefore an information void is created, as mentioned in the theory chapter. It is crucial for the organization, that it controls the information the stakeholders receive, as rumors and untruths otherwise might occur. Kræftens Bekæmpelse identified this information void as critical as Katrine Asp-Poulsen states: "And at this point in time it was very, very difficult to get concrete answers from the authorities" (Appendix 1, 6:59. Translated by author). Because the authorities were busy, it was difficult for cancer patients and relations to get answers to their questions. Thus, Kræftens Bekæmpelse's stakeholders were in an information void, where they did not know how to act, and Kræftens Bekæmpelse identified the need to fill out this information void as Asp-Poulsen states: "So there just was a need to say something clear, to say what does one do in this situation" (Appendix 1, 6:59. Translated by author). However, a risk exists when dealing with an information void, because as the organization needs to be quick in filling out the information void, there is also a risk of making mistakes because of the time pressure. Kræftens Bekæmpelse used the experts available to them when they created the Q&A site as Asp-Poulsen states: "Then we gathered our experts, both psychologists, doctors, and advisers altogether, and we came up with the best possible advises, squinting at what the authorities says of course right?" (Appendix 1, 6:59. Translated by author). By using experts, Kræftens Bekæmpelse reduced the risk of making mistakes in their information to their stakeholders and were thereby able to fill out the information void with

less risk of mistakes. Mistakes which in this crisis could be lethal. Thereby showing the stakeholders that they were in control of the crisis. Kræftens Bekæmpelse made sure that when a question was asked, they answered it as Asp-Poulsen states: "We promised ourselves to say, it is not an option to say, well we don't know, or we don't know how to answer that, or you can figure it out yourself" (Appendix 1, 32:18. Translated by author). This strategy increases the risk of making mistakes when dealing with quick response, as all information may not be available, in a crisis where the pandemic was not in control, and therefore advises might be faulty. However, it was found that Kræftens Bekæmpelse was willing to take this risk, as they had experts advising them, and as one of their main purposes is supporting patients and relations.

By creating the Q&A site, Kræftens Bekæmpelse also managed to speak with one voice, as they reduced the possibility of two stakeholders receiving two different messages. Thereby, when a stakeholder contacts Kræftens Bekæmpelse, they are sure to get the information available. However, some stakeholders need more attention than being referred to a Q&A site. Kræftens Bekæmpelse focuses on answering comments on Facebook, which will be further analyzed later, and here speaking with one voice is an ambition for Kræftens Bekæmpelse as Asp-Poulsen states: "Well, it's the same people who works with it (...) and they are super trained in saying, I'm sorry to hear your sister or something, know that if you need help call Kræftlinjen" (Appendix 1, 29:55. Translated by author). This quote shows that Kræftens Bekæmpelse trains their employees in dealing with stakeholders in need of attentive care, and furthermore trains them in supporting them in the same way every time as Asp-Poulsen further states: "There are these standard phrasings, they use. They do not sit and copy-paste in an extent worth mentioning, but it lies so much in the standard phrasings, which they vary in the individual answers right?" (Appendix 1, 29:55. Translated by author). By training their employees, Kræftens Bekæmpelse also makes sure to create a unity between their employees, and thereby showing control to the stakeholders, as all employees delivers the same accurate and consistent information to the stakeholders.

Furthermore, answering comments on social media, making a Q&A site, and supporting via Kræftlinjen shows the stakeholders that Kræftens Bekæmpelse are available, and the fact that their strategy is not to leave an answer unanswered shows that they are willing to disclose information. About this Asp-Poulsen states: "So, it is our strategy to answer, save those who need it, or help those who need it, answer those who can create a negative atmosphere, and then otherwise give maximum love (...) to everybody else" (Appendix 1, 27:35. Translated by author). This shows that

Kræftens Bekæmpelse has a strategy to be open towards the stakeholders by interacting as much as possible with them, and thereby keeping the stakeholders informed and reassured in that the organization is in control. Kræftens Bekæmpelse met with the authorities to advise them on cancer patients' risks in the COVID-19 pandemic, and the content of these meetings were not something the stakeholders were informed about as Asp-Poulsen states: "But that is something that goes on behind in the dialogue with the authorities, right?" (Appendix 1, 32:18. Translated by author). This is found to be a form of limited disclosure, as the stakeholders are not informed about an important dialogue with the authorities, as this might create uncertainty within the stakeholders. As mentioned, limited disclosure is not to be confused with being dishonest, as limited disclosure only focuses on not informing stakeholders on everything, important or not. No sign of dishonesty in Kræftens Bekæmpelse's communication to their stakeholders was found.

When analyzing the content of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's communication, the first part of this is the first communication to the stakeholders, which was the Q&A site. Instructing information focuses on telling the stakeholders what to do in the crisis and should be the first message to be communicated to the stakeholders. Asp-Poulsen speaks about this when she states: "There was a need for communication about what to do as relation, can we go to the doctor, and why can't we go to the hospital, and well there were incredibly many questions which were urgent" (Appendix 1, 6:59. Translated by author). By making the Q&A site, Kræftens Bekæmpelse made sure that all the questions they were asked were answered and thereby instructing the stakeholders in what to do in the crisis. This satisfies the stakeholders and once again Kræftens Bekæmpelse shows control in the crisis, and thereby upholds their credibility and reputation.

Instructing information must be delivered as quick as possible, and therefore is it important to know where the stakeholders can be reached. As mentioned, Kræftens Bekæmpelse focused on answering comments on social media and made a Q&A site, and the reason for this has been found to be because they have analyzed their social media, specifically Facebook, and their website, cancer.dk, where the Q&A is located, to be the place to communicate to their stakeholders. On this Asp-Poulsen states: "We have 26,000,000 page views a year, so it is a very, very large content site, which is targeted at patients and relations" (Appendix 1, 3:04. Translated by author) and "Well, we have more than a million followers on Facebook solely on our various, on Kræftens Bekæmpelse's main page, but also on some of our campaign sites" (Appendix 1, 1:29. Translated by author). Given the high numbers Asp-Poulsen mentions, it is found that Kræftens Bekæmpelse knew that

their social media and website could be used to deliver the instructing information to their stakeholders.

After communicating the instructing information to the stakeholders, the focus must shift to communicating more details about the crisis and what is being done to fix the crisis, i.e. adjusting information. A crisis depends highly on the stakeholders, as touched upon previously, and the COVID-19 pandemic greatly affected Kræftens Bekæmpelse's stakeholders. One of the effects was that the patients began to worry that going to the doctor or going to cancer treatment would put them in greater danger, in that they would be infected with the virus, than missing the doctor's appointment or cancer treatment. Speaking about their focus on this Asp-Poulsen states: "It has been partly to keep an eye on the course of the treatments, so how quick do you get treatment, but also keep an eye on the number of referrals from general practitioners and so forth right?" (Appendix 1, 23:58. Translated by author). Thus, Kræftens Bekæmpelse's focus in adjusting information has been directed at fixing the crisis, in getting their stakeholders to continue their course of treatment through the COVID-19 pandemic.

When the initial chaos of the crisis has eased off, and the instructing and adjusting information has been communicated to the stakeholders, follow-up communication is the next step in the communication strategy. When the distance requirement was lowered from two meters to one meter, Kræftens Bekæmpelse experienced many inquiries from stakeholders about badges telling people to keep distance as Asp-Poulsen states: "Then we got many inquiries of wishes about, could you get some sort of badge, could you get some sort of vest, could you get something to mark yourself to others and remind them to keep a distance" (Appendix 1, 18:53. Translated by author). Follow-up communication can be targeted at individual stakeholders, addressing their concerns, and therefore when Kræftens Bekæmpelse received concerns from their stakeholders when the crisis developed, they communicated to their stakeholders on their Q&A site that a 'keep distance badge' was available for those in need, and thereby reassuring the stakeholders of their control in the crisis.

Social media

Kræftens Bekæmpelse has more than one million followers on their different Facebook sites, as touched upon previously, sites where they regularly post for their followers. This means that they fulfill the rule of being there before the crisis, as before the COVID-19 pandemic, they had many of

their stakeholders on Facebook, and therefore they were able to both be present and be where the action is when the crisis erupted. About social media Asp-Poulsen states: “And we use them very actively to, of course we have a lot of campaigns which we post, but we also use them very actively to create an engaged community” (Appendix 1, 1:29. Translated by author). This shows that Kræftens Bekæmpelse not only uses their social media to communicate different messages to their followers, but they also try to create a community, which helps them in being present, being where the action is, and especially being there before the crisis. Furthermore, by using the beforementioned listening system, Falcon, Kræftens Bekæmpelse are sure to be present during a crisis, as this is a part of their strategy, as Asp-Poulsen states: “We are, and have always been, extremely attentive towards scanning our different treads for people who reach out for help” (Appendix 1, 26:43. Translated by author). Thus, by scanning and interacting with their followers, in crisis as well as when they are not in a crisis, they show continuity and control, but they also show compassion to their stakeholders by acknowledging and supporting them on social media.

The form and the content of the communication is used to manage the crisis when it has erupted, and Kræftens Bekæmpelse did this by quickly building a Q&A site, which they used to communicate instructing information to their stakeholders. Kræftens Bekæmpelse used experts to develop the content of the Q&A site, in order to avoid mistakes. They also made sure to answer all questions and promised themselves not to leave any stakeholders without an answer, at the risk of providing a wrong answer. By making a Q&A, Kræftens Bekæmpelse managed to speak with one voice, which they also did when answering comments and telephone calls by training their employees in what to answer, and by answering the inquiries from stakeholders they managed to show their availability. Kræftens Bekæmpelse only used limited disclosure once when they advised the authorities on cancer patients and their treatment. In their adjusting information, Kræftens Bekæmpelse managed their stakeholders’ interests by making sure patients kept going to treatments. Patients’ distance worries were the root of their follow-up communication, where Kræftens Bekæmpelse communicated that a badge, reminding people to keep distance, was available. Kræftens Bekæmpelse’s high numbers, engagement, and communities on social media made sure they were present, where the action was, and there before the crisis.

Discussion

In this chapter the findings from the analyses will be critically discussed and compared, in order to answer the problem formulation.

It was found that Kræftens Bekæmpelse focused on answering all questions in the beginning of the crisis, when the stakeholders contacted them, and it was also found that Kræftens Bekæmpelse used limited disclosure just one time. As mentioned, they used the experts available to them when forming the Q&A, however in a crisis where the corona virus was new and scientists had not completely analyzed it, having a strategy not to leave any question unanswered comes at a risk. It is unknown whether this strategy had consequences for the stakeholders, however based on the theory used in this paper, it would not be recommended using such a rigid strategy in a crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the analysis of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook posts, it was found, that they went from recruiting volunteers for their nationwide fundraiser to informing their stakeholders about the COVID-19 pandemic and its effects on cancer patients and relations. This correlates with the analysis of the interview with Katrine Asp-Poulsen, as it was found, that Kræftens Bekæmpelse postponed their nationwide fundraiser, thereby moving the need for recruiting volunteers. Additionally, the intense focus on patients and relations also correlates with the beforementioned finding, as the information focus from Kræftens Bekæmpelse is a way of focusing on supporting the patients and relations.

Furthermore, the increased focus on information found in the analysis of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook posts correlates with the building of the Q&A site, where they offered instructing information to the stakeholders, and the later adjusting information and follow-up communication. This shows that it was not just on Facebook the focus on informing the stakeholders was, as it also was present on Kræftens Bekæmpelse's website for stakeholders to find. Additionally, it identifies the increased information stream as a strategy for Kræftens Bekæmpelse, as in a time when the stakeholders were not able to seek support physically, they would then be able to find it in Kræftens Bekæmpelse's online communication.

Lastly, it was found in the analysis of Kræftens Bekæmpelse's Facebook posts, that despite of the crisis, they continued to build communities on their social media. Again, this correlates with the intense focus on patients and relations, which was found in the analysis of the interview with Asp-Poulsen. Organizations might diverge from their online communication strategies in times of crisis, as focus can be affected by the stress of a crisis. The community building online communication strategy is yet another way Kræftens Bekæmpelse supports their stakeholders, by engaging them in a community with likeminded patients and relations.

Conclusion

Through the analysis of Facebook posts from the nonprofit cancer organization Kræftens Bekæmpelse from before and during the COVID-19 pandemic using a classification scheme, and the analysis of an interview with the Head of Communication and Organizational Development from Kræftens Bekæmpelse using crisis management theory, it can be concluded that the online communication of this nonprofit organization has been affected and changed during the COVID-19 pandemic in the following ways:

Kræftens Bekæmpelse's online communication on Facebook changed from a focus on recruiting volunteers to their nationwide fundraiser, which were to be held when Denmark was in lockdown, to a focus on communicating information to their stakeholders to boost their accountability and public trust in the crisis. However, Kræftens Bekæmpelse did not change their online communication completely, as their focus on building and maintaining communities on Facebook continued as usual when Denmark went into lockdown.

Kræftens Bekæmpelse's online communication was affected by the crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic, in that they were forced to postpone their nationwide fundraiser, something that led them to begin using Facebook donations instead. This correlated with the decreased number of recruiting posts on their Facebook. Additionally, Kræftens Bekæmpelse's focused on answering questions they found to be relevant for their stakeholders by quickly building a Q&A site on their website, thereby speaking with one voice, and showing their availability. Their strategy was to answer all questions they were asked, at the risk of providing the stakeholders with an insufficient or wrong answer, even though the answers were based on advice from the experts available. Furthermore, it was found that Kræftens Bekæmpelse focused heavily on patients and relations, correlating with the focus on informing and community building on Facebook. Kræftens Bekæmpelse focused on making sure patients kept going to treatments and patients' distance worries, where Kræftens Bekæmpelse advocated for a badge reminding people to keep a distance. Kræftens Bekæmpelse's presence on social media made sure that they could use their Facebook effectively to inform their stakeholders when the crisis erupted.

As the COVID-19 vaccine is now beginning to be distributed to both health professionals and civilians, the restrictions of the COVID-19 pandemic will hopefully fade, and cancer patients and other vulnerable people can hopefully lessen their worries one at a time.

References

- Bryman, Alan. 2016. *Social Research Method*, Oxford.
- Coombs, W. Timothy. 2012. *Ongoing Crisis Communication*, SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Creswell, John W. 2014. *Research Design*, SAGE Publications, Ltd, 4th ed.
- Flick, Uwe. 2007. "Sampling, Selecting and Access." In *Designing Qualitative Research, Qualitative Research Kit*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd. 25-35.
- Freeman, R. Edward. 1984. *Strategic Management*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greer, Clark F. & Moreland, Kurt D. 2003. "United Airlines' and American Airlines' online crisis communication following the September 11 terrorist attacks." *Public Relations Review* 29 (2003) 427-441.
- Jones, Barrie L. & Chase, W. Howard. 1979. "Managing public policy issues." *Public Relations Review*, 5 (2), 3-23.
- Kvale, Steinar. 2007. *Doing interviews*, London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Lovejoy, Kristen & Saxton, Gregory D. 2012. "Information, Community, and Action: How Nonprofit Organizations Use Social Media." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 17 (2012) 337-353.
- Lucas, Evie. 2017. "Reinventing the rattling tin: How UK charities use Facebook in fundraising." *International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 1-9.
- Salmons, Janet. 2018. "Using Social Media in Data Collection: Designing Studies with the Qualitative E-Research Framework." In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media Research Methods*, SAGE Publications, Ltd. 177-196.
- Sturges, David L. 1994. "Communicating Through Crisis." *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 3, (1994) 297-316.
- Sundhedsstyrelsen, 2020. *Personer med øget risiko ved COVID-19*.

Waters, Richard D., Burnett, Emily, Lamm, Anna & Lucas, Jessica. 2009. "Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook." *Public Relations Review* 35 (2009) 102–106.

Website content

Collins. n.d. "not-for-profit organization." Accessed January 3, 2021.

<https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/not-for-profit-organization>

Danish Cancer Society. n.d. "The Danish Cancer Society." Accessed December 22, 2020.

<https://www.cancer.dk/international/about-the-danish-cancer-society/>

Kræftens Bekæmpelse. 2020. "Økonomisk overblik." Accessed December 22, 2020.

<https://www.cancer.dk/om-os/oekonomi/oekonomisk-overblik/>

Regeringen. 2020. "Statsministeren: Der bliver brug for, at vi hjælper hinanden." Accessed

December 28, 2020. <https://www.regeringen.dk/nyheder/2020/pressemedde-11-marts-i-spejlsalen/>

Statens Serum Institut. 2020. "Første dansker testet positiv for COVID-19." Accessed December

30, 2020. https://www.ssi.dk/aktuelt/nyheder/2020/02_27_foerste-tilfaelde-af-ny-coronavirus-i-dk

WHO/Europe. 2020. "WHO announces COVID-19 outbreak a pandemic." Accessed December 30,

2020. [https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic#:~:text=COVID%2D19%20can%20be,growing%20number%20of%20countries.)

[19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic#:~:text=COVID%2D19%20can%20be,growing%20number%20of%20countries.)

[pandemic#:~:text=COVID%2D19%20can%20be,growing%20number%20of%20countries.](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic#:~:text=COVID%2D19%20can%20be,growing%20number%20of%20countries.)