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Abstract

How a sustainability-oriented campaign can use social media to encourage citizens to make change towards more sustainable lifestyles is the outline of this thesis. The studied case is GreenhackGBG, a sustainability project managed by the city of Gothenburg which strives to affect citizens to change practices in their everyday life. The focus of this thesis is to see how the communication project utilizes social media as a communication tool. Since the role of social media in society constantly increases, it is essential to understand how relations online affects the offline context. In the case of GreenhackGBG it is crucial to understand how to create informative content online so it encourages the receivers to make requested changes in the offline context, the everyday life. Therefore the thesis also focuses on how social media could be utilized and used as a facilitator in projects, discussions and debates. The thesis has an explorative qualitative approach, with semi-structured interviews with participants and project management as main data gathering method. Results shows differences in effects between social media platforms, which suggests the importance of adapted communication strategies. The challenges and importance of the tone in communication, especially for a city as a public authority is evident. GreenhackGBG exemplify the difficulty of measurability of participation practices online. This research contributes to the area of social media studies combined with sustainability and communication. Since social media as a communication tool increases in importance, this thesis also serves as a contribution to knowledge development considering social media strategies for public authorities.
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Popular scientific summary

Currently we live in a society that constantly struggles with the knowledge of how we live today has an impact on the future. Sustainability has become an inevitable aspect of the society; with global UN meetings, prospering societal debates, politics, as well as it affects individuals choices in life. Sustainability is about creating long-lasting changes in society through commitment and involvement by all societal actors, increase inclusion, awareness and change. Public participation is considered as one crucial aspect for this kind of change processes, and in order to create participation and inclusion, communication is essential. Today communication through various media have become natural part of our everyday lives, especially social media have been a big game changer. Everyday communication and sociality have to a large degree adapted social media into everyday practices and is today a given part of people’s everyday lives. In order to understand the relationship between social media and sustainability communication this thesis will look at the case of GreenhackGBG to see how social media is utilized. The approach is to see if it is possible to create information online that the receiver translates and adapts into changes in the offline life. The public campaign, GreenhackGBG is a pioneering project, adapting new approaches for a city managed communication project. The subject and case serves both as a study that researches the practice around social media use for sustainability communication, but also as an evaluation of the first trial year of GreenhackGBG. The thesis shows there are many positive qualities connected to the use of social media, though one big challenge is to evaluate participation and how to show to what extent change is created through a project in social media. This thesis serves as a study that increases knowledge of social media use to promote sustainability, as well as a study of social media use as a tool for communication by a public authority.
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1. Introduction

We live in a society where communication and media have become stronger and more influential aspects of our everyday lives, where more aspects of our lives take place online or is mediated through various platforms and communication channels, such as social media; social worlds are going digital (Kozinets, 2010) and society changes into a networking society (Castells, 2010). The everyday communication and sociality has to a large degree adapted computer mediatized communication as tools for social interaction, where the Internet and social media platforms have become an inevitable aspects of societies, organizations, and individuals (Howard, 2011).

A step towards changes in society has been the increased knowledge and acknowledgement of the current unsustainable development, degrading ecosystems and decreasing the wellbeing amongst people and increasing disparity. Thereby sustainability has become an inevitable aspect of societal debates and is an integrated part of politics and decision making. Through the 17 so called UN Sustainable development goals and Agenda 2030 the importance to act and change have been acknowledged (“SDGs .:. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform”, n.d.). Through these goals the aim with the sustainable development goals is to create long lasting changes through joint efforts in order to reach a sustainable world (“Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development .:. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform”, n.d.). In other words the goal is to achieve long lasting changes through inclusion and participation on every level. With that in mind, this thesis will look at how a public campaign/project, GreenhackGBG, uses social media and other communication tools in order to reach out and engage citizens in topics related to sustainability and encourage them to change aspects of some of their everyday practices.

Historically there has been a development regarding public media, where the original sorts of media are defined as ‘one-way public’ media such as books or movies as well as so called ‘two-way private’ media e.g. telephones (Shirky, 2010). The major change has been the development of the two-way media which creates connections between the public and private spheres. Private conversations are today possible to carry out in public settings, so they are practically broadcasted (Shirky, 2010) which social media is an example of.

Today it is more important than ever to utilize new digital technology in order to gain the opportunities it creates. The digitalization of media enables sharing of resources, knowledge and goodwill amongst one and other, and thereby transform the world on a larger scale than before (Shirky, 2010).

Shirky (2010) means that media should be considered as a connective tissue of current society, enabling connections amongst almost all aspects of life and actors in the societal setting. On a personal scale; reminding when friends birthdays are up-coming, up to a global scale; where media makes information about what happens on the other side of the world easy accessible. The development of the Internet and social media has also emerged new structures and mechanisms of communication amongst humans (Slevin, 2000). Thereby the Internet enables and facilitates new ways of collaboration and communication, that previously been dependent to location, time and space (Slevin, 2000).

Social media is today a large part of people’s everyday life (Shirky, 2010), it has become a tool for communication, both amongst individuals as well as communication between
individuals and large scale actors in society. Shirky (2010) means that the speed of development is connected to the intrinsic qualities of social media and the values social media platforms creates for its users; such as low cost needed to create or share information, low costs or energy required to participate, and that the participation enables instant satisfaction. Although the satisfaction only lasts for a shorter while, the reward usually motivates future activities (Shirky, 2010). Social media and so called CMC:s (Computer Mediatized communication) creates loops that supports and enrich the social media in itself, which translates into continued usage by its users (Shirky, 2010).

1.1 GreenhackGBG

The case used in this thesis is GreenhackGBG, a project initiated by the city of Gothenburg, the second biggest city in Sweden with roughly 548 000 residents (“Gothenburg - statistics”, n.d.). GreenhackGBG is a project managed by the Environmental Department, Department for Consumer and Civil services, Department of Waste and Water as well as the District Administrations of Lundby and Västra Göteborg (Utvärdering av GreenhackGBG, 2015). The aim is to create greener, healthier and richer lives and city, which is achieved through information sharing and promotion of activities and solutions applicable on the everyday life of the citizens. It is done by inviting citizens to participate in public “challenges” and by showing how it is possible to make small changes and although have an impact with more sustainable lives without having a negative influence on the quality of life (“Greenhackgbg - Homepage”, n.d.). GreenhackGBG is described as follows:

*We want you to get involved, in order to create a sustainable Gothenburg together. Everything counts, even the smallest efforts every day. Take a small step, and then one more. Each and every one can find a level of involvement in this project. There are no constraints.* (“Greenhackgbg - Homepage”, n.d.).

The name GreenhackGBG is developed from the concept of so called “lifehacks”; which is the common nominator of creative ideas and solutions created in order to find solutions to everyday issues and problems. GreenhackGBG is a project based on lifehacks that focusses on sustainability and environmental issues and solutions (“Om GreenhackGBG, 2016”, n.d.)

GreenhackGBG is a step on the way, since Gothenburg aims to become one of the most progressive cities in the world considering activities to decrease climate change, and thereby be a pioneering city that others can draw inspiration from. In this process the city of Gothenburg developed a climate strategic programme (“Klimatstrategiskt program, Göteborg stad 2014”, n.d.). In this programme one of the strategies is called “Climate-smart citizens of Gothenburg”, and GreenhackGBG is one of the projects that are connected to this. The aim is to give the citizens tools and solutions which enables them to change their lifestyles and become more sustainable and thereby decrease their CO2-emissions (“Om GreenhackGBG, 2016,” n.d.).

GreenhackGBG is developed from a project called “Leva Livet”(Vårt Göteborg - Göteborgs stads nyhetstidning, 2010), which was a small-scale project that approached 10 selected families in the city, with the aim to challenge and help those families to make changes in their lives in order to become more sustainable during 2010-2011. The ideas and framework from this project were developed and adapted to what then became GreenhackGBG. Today the project uses various social media platforms; Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and their homepage.
for their communication towards the citizens of Gothenburg (“Greenhackgbg - Homepage”, n.d.). The different platforms are used with slightly different strategies and therefore there are a broad range of communication activities used in the project. The ideas with GreenhackGBG is to enable sharing of ideas and solutions concerning sustainability and environment towards, as well as amongst the citizens (“Om GreenhackGBG, 2016”, n.d.).

One important catch phrase in the project description, which is also highlighted throughout GreenhackGBG is that “Everyone can do something” (“Greenhackgbg - Homepage”, n.d.) According to GreenhackGBG, the important thing is not that everyone has to totally change ways of life, but rather do something; no matter if it is a big or small change. The project aims at increasing the general knowledge concerning sustainability and to making citizens of Gothenburg involved and aware of sustainability issues and solutions available. The idea to use social media is grounded in the inherent possibilities and qualities of social media – since it is an efficient tool in order to both share ideas and to create spaces where it is possible to be inspired by others, as GreenhackGBG puts it: “Let other ‘Greenhackers’ inspire you to do great deeds” (“Greenhackgbg - Homepage”, n.d.). Since the project is meant to increase the public awareness and incorporate ideas that are easily adaptable to everyday actions, the lives of the citizens will hopefully become more sustainable by easy means and thereby also the city of Gothenburg becomes more sustainable.

1.1.1 GreenhackGBG – an overview

GreenhackGBG uses a variety of social media platforms and different communication strategies, including hosting open challenges and specific activities in order to get in contact with the citizens of Gothenburg. The different platforms and communication strategies of GreenhackGBG will be presented briefly in this section. Initially, GreenhackGBG was developed based on the experiences and knowledge from the Leva Livet-project. Activities and communication has been adapted in order to reach a broader audience and here follows the descriptions and information about the up to date numbers of followers on each platform. Followers is used by the same definition as Facebook; To follow someone, an organization or company means you get updates and see their posts in your news-feed (Facebook, 2016, n.d.).

**Facebook** – [https://www.facebook.com/](https://www.facebook.com/) Founded in 2004 with the aim to enable people to connect, share and express what matters to them. It empowers people to create a more open and connected globally since the platform helps people to discover what happens in the world, (“Facebook - FAQ”, n.d.).

GreenhackGBG have up-to-date: 2604 followers on Facebook.

**Instagram** – [https://www.instagram.com/](https://www.instagram.com/) Instagram is a social media tool, connected to Facebook which enables people to share their life through pictures. ”(“FAQ • Instagram”, n.d.). Instagram is the most successful social media platform in GreenhackGBG according to the project management and bloggers.

GreenhackGBG have up-to-date: 2430 followers on Instagram.

**Twitter** – [https://twitter.com/?lang=sv](https://twitter.com/?lang=sv) Twitter is a social media tool that enables quick communication through Tweets; 140 character text messages, with or without photos, videos or links. (““Twitter - FAQ”, n.d.)
Twitter is the latest social media platform that has been added to GreenhackGBG, up-to-date: 676 followers.

# (Hashtags) – GreenhackGBG has its own hashtag #GreenhackGBG, which is used to interlink the content in the different platforms. The goal is to enable participants to interact and contribute with their pictures and posts connected to the theme GreenhackGBG.

Homepage - www.greenhackgbg.se - The homepage is the platform that contains the densest information. The platform contains the GreenhackGBG-blog, information about the GreenhackGBG project, description of the themes that been part of the project this far, and additionally challenges, ideas and suggestions of what changes and activities individuals can do by themselves. (“Greenhackgbg - Homepage”, n.d.) The GreenhackGBG-homepage is developed and administrated by the city of Gothenburg. At it aims to inspire and spread information about sustainability.

The homepage does not have the same possibility to have “followers” in similar manners as Facebook and Instagram, though, the city of Gothenburg have visitor statistics as seen below;

![Sessions Graph](image)

Table 1. Visitor statistics 2015 at homepage www.greenhackgbg.se.

The number of visitors at the homepage is defined as “sessions”. A session is the amount of visits the homepage have had during a specific period of time, in this case each month during 2015. The graph shows how the amount of visitors at the GreenhackGBG homepage have varied during the first year.

E-mail: In addition to these platforms, citizens are able to sign up for a monthly informative e-mails, where the latest information and news connected to GreenhackGBG activities are collected. The Up-to-date number of receivers of this e-mail is: 1286 persons. And of these: 319 persons are signed up for an additional weekly e-mail, which aims to encourage the participants even more.

Seminars: GreenhackGBG have hosted approximately 1 breakfast seminar each month. These seminars are connected to the monthly theme, where an eco-breakfast is served and a
special guest gives a lecture about the theme. During 2015 the seminars have had a total of 858 visitors ("Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015", 2016)

**Event – “Sluta snacka – börja Greenhacka”:** An activity day in 2015, where visitors could visit a full-day event where different activities, speeches and lectures as well as “greenhacks” for inspiration to live more sustainable lifestyles were promoted during the day. The event had approximately 350-400 visitors ("Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015", 2016)

**Monthly themes and challenges:** During the first trial year, monthly themes were used as a framework for GreenhackGBG. Every month had a specific theme and “challenges” connected to those themes. These were promoted to the participants through the GreenhackGBG platforms and e-mails. Challenges are connected to the monthly themes and aims to inspire citizens to take easily achievable steps towards a more sustainable lifestyle. The challenges are designed to function as encouragement and the citizens are able to be inspired by them in the way that suits them best, for example as an inspiration to competition between friends or family ("Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015", 2016).

**Themes during 2015:** Leisure time; Energy; Consumption and waste; Travelling; Chemicals; Sustainable food; Sustainable consumption; Climate-smart food ("Greenhackgbg - Homepage", n.d.).

**Example of challenges:** (during 2015) Defrost the fridge; Buy LED-lights next time a lightbulb needs to be changed; Borrow things instead of buying; Buy more second-hand, ethically or eco labelled product; Use more public transportation; Sanitize the bathroom/home from chemicals ("Greenhackgbg - Homepage", n.d.).

Today strict monthly themes are not as prominent in the project anymore, since it opens up GreenhackGBG and makes it possible to adapt the communication to ongoing societal debates, themes or happenings on a shorter notice. Although, challenges are still part of the communication strategy.

1.2 Why conduct this study?

Today there is a need to increase the knowledge and understanding of what effects social interactions online can have on the offline reality. Since the role of social media in society consistently increases, it is important to understand how relations online affects offline relations and how ICT:s (Information and communication Technologies) and CMC:s (computer mediatized communication) interconnects with, and affects the structure and function of social systems (Jones, 1999). What role social media have today, and what role it possibly could have in the future are questions important to study in order to understand the full complexity of it (Jones, 1999).

In the context of GreenhackGBG, it is important to understand how well the communication strategies functions and how well the social media platforms are utilized, in order to further develop and adapt the project. Since it is a project taking place mostly in an online context, with the aim to change behaviour in the offline context, the connection between these two is even more important to understand. GreenhackGBG aims to change attitudes as well as behaviour amongst the citizens (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016).
This thesis partly builds on a paper the City of Gothenburg created after an evaluation of the first trial year of the GreenhackGBG project during late 2015 (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016). Even though the evaluation report is thorough, it lacks the aspects of participation and dialogue as aspects of the project. The report rather focuses on the actual communication that the city of Gothenburg has done through the campaign, such as communication strategies and internal processes. The processes that takes place between the campaign initiators and the participants is the gap of knowledge that needs to be covered and studied.

1.3 The aim:

There is a need to understand how long lasting changes are achievable, and in what way the evolving spheres of social media could be utilized in order to do so. Involvement, inclusions and public participation are all essential aspects of successful change processes, and therefore it is important to understand how social media as social spheres could contribute to involvement and participation. In order to examine that, this thesis will look at how communication taking place in social media, can affect the receivers’ everyday offline life by the online communication. The thesis aim to increase the knowledge if and how social media functions as an enabler and facilitator of participatory practices as well as a tool to not only communicate, but also encourage sustainability changes.

The overarching research question for this thesis is:

*How can a sustainability oriented campaign make use of social media, to encourage citizens to change?*

In order to explore this, the case of GreenhackGBG will be studied and questions that will be focused on are:

- How is social media utilized in the case of GreenhackGBG?
- In what ways does GreenhackGBG create opportunities for participation?
- What does the participating citizens do with the communicated content from GreenhackGBG?

2. Background

2.1 Development of the Internet

Already during early 1990’s discussions concerning the impact of the Internet on society and peoples social lives became a hot topic (Kraut et al., 1998). Discussions questioned whether the Internet should be considered as a paradox that reduces or increases social involvement and people’s wellbeing (Kraut et al., 1998). Discussions about the Internet and its influence on its users evolved in corresponding pace as it developed (Kraut et al., 1998).

Robert Kraut (1998) scrutinized the Internet as he reflects upon the ongoing discussions concerning the paradox of it; whether the development of the Internet improves or harms the individuals’ participatory practices in community life and social relationships. The report explores the psychological and social impact of the Internet, and according to Kraut (1998) there are evidence that shows connections between increases of communication online with a coinciding decrease of communication taking place offline amongst households, social
circles, where an increased rate of depression and loneliness also is seen. In similarity, discussions flourished back when the amount of televisions increased; and a large scale decline in civic engagement and participation in the US concerning the everyday life of people was experienced (Putnam, 2001). The expansion of televisions in citizens’ everyday life was partly blamed back then (Putnam, 1995, in Kraut 1998). In other words Putnam (1995) concluded that people’s social engagement decreased, and he predicted the Internet to have the same effects on individuals life as the entry of the television previously had. Kraut (1998) results are though ambiguous; he shows results that connects online activity to people who becomes socially isolated and cut off from social relationships in the offline environment. Although, Kraut (1998) also emphasizes that the Internet improves social relationships rather than damages them, since constraints such as geographic distance and time decreases, which enables communication to flourish in other settings. The Internet also “enables individuals to join groups of common interests rather than based on convenience” (Kraut, 1998:1017) which enables connections to evolve regardless former restrictions. The evolving nature of computerized communication tools changes societies and have similar effects as globalization has had previously (Kraut et al., 1998). This possibly sparks the potential to get people involved and accept changes, since new ideas and behaviour are seen as a reaction towards social surroundings and contexts (Kraut et al., 1998).

Also Price Capella (2002) discusses the tendency to actively take part in society thanks to social media, where they show that already during the election of 2000 an increased use of Computer mediated Communication (CMC:s) increased the engagement and active involvement in political discussions (Price Capella, 2002).

According to Slevin (2000) the Internet have been a source for a large scale transformation of society, since it enabled the creation of more complex relationships between state, organizations, companies and individuals. The Internet have also had the impact on the order of change where Slevin (2000) means that the Internet enables anyone to make things happen, rather than just have things happening to them. I other words the Internet empowers the individual, and brings together different societal actors which creates so called new forms of solidarity regardless social, geographical or other former restrictions (Slevin, 2000).

2.1.1 Social media

Today individuals are able to actively be part of the production as well as the reproduction of meaning in society (Kozintes, 2010). Technologies are embedded in the everyday life of a large part of the world population, and thereby we are constantly able to partake in ongoing processes (Kozinets, 2010). Social media are today considered as online facilitators of human networks, that happens to also affect what individuals thinks and does (van Dijck, 2013). Social media are technology driven by the need of information, connectivity and networking, and it is a social sphere where different voices are allowed, which thereby includes a broader scope of the society into social movements (van Dijck, 2013). As Van Dijck (2013) explains, that the Internet has undergone a transformation from so called networked communication towards a sociality based on platforms. This is a development that resulted in new cultures of participation and connectivity, connecting individuals into a global context (Van Dijck, 2013).

As Fuchs (2014) explains, “social media is the dialectic between human connectivity and technological infrastructure” (Fuchs, 2014, p. 37). Where the current technology has enabled
humans to connect to each other, social media has become the solution that enables us to utilize the communicative possibilities technology can offer us today (Fuchs, 2014).

However, some researchers question the usefulness and all positive view on social media. Social media is thereby seen as a tool for revolution, where spreading the word and reach participants is much easier than before (Bennett and Segerberg, 2011). On the one hand, social media has become a tool that increases civic engagement and political activism since it enables personalization of collective action, which increases the level of engagement and strengthens networks (Bennett and Segerberg, 2011). On the other hand, negative aspects regarding social media means it could be considered as exploitative, used for surveillance, censoring as well as based on exploitation of labour, since the content in social media is created by its users (Fuchs, 2014). Van Dijck (2013) means that social media is simultaneously empowering as well as exploitative.

In other words, social media is an area of study in need of further exploration and research. The total influence social media has on politics and activism is not fully understood in academia; social media is acknowledged for both qualities such as enabling public participation, as a facilitator of communication, and a connector that enables collective actions (Selander and Jarvenpaa, 2013). Social media is acknowledged for negative aspects influencing society and public participation. To a certain extent it is a tool that shapes online behaviour since it enables and constraints use of social media (Selander and Jarvenpaa, 2013) and thereby risks to reinforce structural and societal inequalities.

2.2 To study the Internet

Since the Internet is an intertwined part of individuals’ everyday life and part of the societal structure, it needs to be examined and understood in order to explain our society. One common way to studying society and the world we live in, is to do ethnographical studies.

Ethnography is an explorative approach of research that seeks to understand the world we live in. Studies are conducted through studies of real world/’natural’ situations, and the data is obtained by the researcher. The ethnographical approach aims to understand culture, ways of life, meaning making practices, values, beliefs, knowledge and motivations, in order to explain why the world functions in a certain way and what the effects of existing structures are (Kozinets, 2010).

Today technologies are embedded in the everyday practices of life, in the structure of the world on a global scale, as well as it is a major contributor to the creation of identity on an individual level. Kozinets (2010) means that there is a great importance to increase the understanding of practices online, in order to understand the current society.

2.2.1 (N)ethnography

Nethnography is the denomination of ethnographic research adapted to include the Internet and its influence on contemporary social worlds, to understand the development of internet and social media within the context of society (Kozinets, 2010). This development is a fact since Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) have drastically increased during the latest decades. This development has not surprised the area of research, since social
worlds are increasingly going digital and the differences between online and offline communities is corresponding constantly decreasing (Kozinets, 2010).

A nethnographical approach focuses on so called networked sociality (Kozinets, 2010). Kozinets (2010) sees the Internet as a possible social space, where research aims to understand social interaction that takes place, what kind of user generated information is created and what kind of embedded cultures that could be made visible. These studies are supposed to deepen the understanding of the participants in order to understand embedded views, meaning making processes and cultures, which are created within the social space of the Internet and social media platforms (Kozinets, 2010).

During the late 1990’s, researchers implied that it is impossible to separate the offline-reality from the online-reality, since the society to a large extent is dependent and intertwined to the Internet and especially the communication tools it provides (Wellman and Hampton, 1999). Similarly, researchers claims that online and offline environments influence each other mutually, the connections between online and offline realities increases (Kozinets, 2010). The divergence between online and offline communities and lives decreases, and today they have a mutual effect on each other and should and could therefore not be understood apart. (Kozinets, 2010; Sveningsson et al., 2003) This is why it is useful to combine the nethnographical approach with other methods in order to connect the online sociality to the offline sociality.

2.2.2 Combination of Ethnography and Nethnography

Online and offline worlds mutually influence and changes each other, thereby it is not possible to understand them if they are studied apart (Kozinets 2010). Kozinetz (2010) means that ethnography can and should be combined with other methods in order to increase the understanding as well as giving applicable conclusions that describes the online and offline realities, in the same way as they mutually influences each other (Kozinets, 2010) For this thesis a nethnographical approach is useful to a certain extent, but cannot be used exclusively. Since this thesis aims to bring understanding to how a project practiced online can have an impact and create changes in the offline sociality and environment.

2.2.3 Netiquette – ethics of Internet research

Already during the late 1990’s the Internet was acknowledged as a very useful source for collection of research data (Jones, 1999) Since the Internet both enables easy collection of data, but also facilitates interviews and spreading of information, connects people who otherwise possibly had not been reached. The Internet creates opportunities for people to get involved in settings they otherwise possibly would not be part of (Jones, 1999).

The Internet is according to Sharf (1999, in Jones, 1999) a great source of information when conducting qualitative research. Since it contains easily accessible information, so called “interpersonal talk”” (Jones, 1999, p. 244), it makes it possible to analyse social settings, without the need to be at a specific place during a specific time. The Internet as a social setting where communication takes place, enables analysis, since conversations that takes place on the Internet or social media platforms are easily recallable since they are in print (Jones, 1999). This built-in feature is highly useful for research, since data on the Internet is often easily accessible (Jones, 1999).
2.3 Social media as part of societal establishment

When the interest of a study is to increase the understanding of the online social realities that individuals are part of, the study has to be conducted within that reality. Similarly if the aim is to understand individual characteristics and roles in the offline environment the study has to be conducted in that offline reality (Sveningsson et al., 2003). Today the online reality is often an equally important aspect of the reality we live and act within the online reality is used as a tool in the offline reality. The use of (social) media platforms are today used as tools to communicate as well as express, create, shape and reinforce culture and identities on individual as well as organizational level (Sveningsson et al., 2003; Kozinets, 2010).

Even though CMC:s are considered to enable communication beyond physical borders, Papacharissi (2011) means that connections and communication that takes place in an online setting, often still depends on connections offline. Communities online are defined as extensions of geographically situated offline communities, into the online context. (Papacharissi, 2011).

Social media is also a tool that interlinks people and creates connections: “‘[t]oday not only people link groups, also groups’ link people to each other. A so called ‘duality of person and group’’” (Jones, 1999, p. 86). The development of social media has changed the structures of how communication on individual as well as organizational level functions. Through the Internet and social media it has become possible to find content through people, as well as find and connect to people through content (Jones, 1999). This is something that has had a major impact on social movements as well as capability of people to network. Social media has become a tool that marks personalization, where a possibility to make ‘statements’ by choosing certain ways of life and show those to others are qualities of current communication (Bennett and Segerberg, 2011). Social media functions as a window where individuals are able to show who they are and what they want to be defined as, with whom. The use of media and technology enables so called personalization of collective action (Bennett and Segerberg, 2011).

2.4 Participatory practices

According to (Ledwith and Springett, 2010), participation is a way of living, a way of seeing the world as well as a way of being in the world. Participatory practices as a definition is often connected to community development practices, and was acknowledged already during the early 1970’s. During that time the main aim was to reach social change, social justice and sustainability through collective actions (Ledwith and Springett, 2010). Ledwith & Springett (2010) acknowledge today that dialogue with locals and those who will be affected by a processes or change is crucial in order to reach change that is accepted on a broad scale and implemented in the long run.

Ledwith & Springett (2010) describe the importance of participation as “‘[t]o be denied the capacity for potentially successful participation is to be denied one’s humanity’”(Ledwith and Springett, 2010, p. 13). The same authors mean that communities need to be involved in decision-making processes when the result of a change or decision will influence them. As expressed in the quote above, if people are not enabled participation, they are neglected one of their human rights. To give voice to those who risks to be marginalized and not heard or acknowledged when decisions are made is crucial in order to reach long-term changes and
sustainability. In order to create this cooperation, diversity and quality is key in order to understand the interconnectedness in society (Ledwith and Springett, 2010). Social justice, environmental sustainability and collective well-being is the core in order to utilize the potential participatory practices creates (Ledwith and Springett, 2010).

Dialogue aims to increase understanding amongst participants of a project and thereby recognize that there are different truths as well as ways to experience and make sense of the world (Ledwith and Springett, 2010). Ledwith & Springett (2010) argue that we live in a society where dialogue is one of the essential aspects of participatory practices: “absence of dialogue reinforces a world of conflict, of ‘other’, of fear” (Ledwith and Springett, 2010, p. 127). If there is no communication, deliberation or common meaning making there are no participatory practices and thereby there is a risk that processes towards change is not achieved successfully because of fear or conflicts towards the requested changes (Ledwith and Springett, 2010). In similar manners, Jones (1999) discusses the importance of increasing positive attitudes towards changes, in order to achieve behavioural changes on individual level. Jones (1999) means it is possible to create positive attitudes towards changes, through so called re-building of social trust on-line (Jones, 1999, p. 100). Trust is considered to be an essential part of changing processes, in order to reach long lasting changes (Jones, 1999; Macias, 2015). If participants don’t trust the actor who requires a change there could be issues to achieve those changes. In other words, participation and dialogue is essential, in order to create motivation and changes which are accepted by those who will be affected by the requested changes (Macias, 2015).

2.4.1 Social media as a tool for participatory practices

Public participation is a current topic of discussion as seen in Ledwith & Springett (2010), and it raises issues of how to include and create space for involvement and dialogue, as well as create participatory practices “for real”. How does all this affect participatory practices that evolves in social media? Are they efficient and do they create participation “for real”? This is a question dividing social media research; some means social media is an enabler of public participation, since it shifts traditional relationships between political authority and the public (Gladwell, 2010). Social media is thus seen as an enabler for previously powerless societal groups to find easier ways to collaborate, coordinate and give voice concerning their views and wishes in societal movements and discussions (Gladwell, 2010). Gladwell (2010) means social media enables public participation since it decreases the required motivation in order to become participants. But he also means that the activism that is created in social media don’t have the strength to create revolutions or large scale political changes in society (Gladwell, 2010).

Social media is also blamed to rather create a wave of ‘slacktivism’, where the activism is only “clicking” and “liking” without any inherent ground (van Dijck, 2013). Though, studies shows the opposite; that social media and online networks creates a broad mass of slacktivists, who are of great importance in societal processes (Barberá et al., 2015). Barberá, et al., (2015) defines slacktivists as peripheral online participants who commits on a shallow level in discussions, activities and activism online. With this its meant that even though slacktivists are not seen as the core of movements or activism, they are important participants of online activism since their power lays in the amount of them (Barberá, et al., 2015). As Sandra González-Bailón (2015) expressed it; “Peripheral users are not ‘slacktivists.’ They are
quintessential to understand why products go viral or protests go big.” (“Annenberg School for Communication, 2015”, n.d.). In other words, they are considered as important actors, since the aggregated contribution to spread a message or activism thanks to the number peripheral participants is comparable to the power that lays within the highly committed core participants who are a minority within online movements (Barberá et al., 2015)

According to Selander & Jarvenpaa (2013), social media exposes relationships between individuals as well as ideas and opinions. Social media could thereby be defined as a social sphere which enables individuals to form groupings, create social networks and organizations for ideas and information sharing. It is an arena that has challenged previous hierarchical structures of society, which has enabled changes in power division and possibilities to influence (Selander and Jarvenpaa, 2013).

2.5 Sustainable development

Sustainable development is a concept most known by the definition is presented in the paper ‘Our common Future’, also known as the Brundtland report, from 1987 (“Our common future, 1987”, n.d.). This definition staked the first clear definition of what sustainable development means and describes how sustainability should be achieved.

One of the more quoted definitions of sustainable development, from the Brundtland report is: “Make development sustainable to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. In other words, the aim is to enable people to live today to secure their needs, on the condition that this won’t impair the possibilities of future generations to do the same (“Our common future, 1987,” n.d.).

In the Brundtland (1987) report it is stated that sustainability and a sustainable future is only possible to achieve through changes in attitudes, social values and aspirations. And all of these promoted changes are only possible to achieve through campaigns of education, debate and public participation, thereby the report pushes the importance to include all societal actors in order to create a public awareness concerning the issues we will face (“Our common future, 1987”, n.d.).

The Sustainable Development goals and the Agenda 2030 for sustainable development is the framework for the work that has to be done. There are 17 goals, that covers all aspects of sustainability; ecological, economic and social (“SDGs .:. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform”, n.d.). GreenhackGBG aims to create changes that will have an impact on the ongoing climate changes. The climate strategic programme (“Klimatstrategiskt program, Göteborg stad 2014”, n.d.) accepted by the city of Gothenburg is connected to No. 13 of the Sustainable Development Goals; Climate Action(“SDGs .:. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform”, n.d.).

3. Methodology

3.1 Exploratory research

This thesis aims to understand how social media could be utilized when communicating sustainable development. In order to make this feasible within the scope of my project work, I decided to look at a specific case, GreenhackGBG, which could begin to reveal insights into how social media can be used and what the opportunities and challenges are. Since
GreenhackGBG is a pioneering project, I wanted to keep an open, exploratory approach to whatever themes would emerge from the study. Therefore, I decided to draw inspiration from Grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) when analysing my data, which I will describe below.

3.1.1 Grounded theory

Grounded theory is a way of thinking about data (Oktay, 2012). It is an approach that influences the process, conceptualization and theorizing, and thereby influences the research method (Oktay, 2012). The roots for Grounded Theory lies in ‘Symbolic interactionism’, developed from studies of social action and theory development, combined with a pragmatic approach towards research. (Oktay, 2012). Basic ideas within Symbolic interactionism are that humans act towards things and ideas based on the meaning they have connected to them, where social interaction processes shapes ideas and meaning (Charmaz, 2006; Oktay, 2012). The dynamic processes between people and the environment they act within are important aspects to highlight, since the reality is dynamic, and constantly changes based on interactions and social processes (Oktay, 2012).

Grounded theory as a theoretical approach is one of the more frequently used theories for qualitative research since the approach enables the researcher to understand the reality and the world (Oktay, 2012; Charmaz, 2006). The Classic Grounded Theory, as Glaser & Strauss (1967) discussed it, theory is seen as something that emerges from data, separated from the scientific observer. But this is an idea that is questioned by Charmaz (2006) who means that neither data or theories are discovered by researchers, since we are part of the world we study and the data we collect (Charmaz, 2006).

The grounded theory approach is based on empirical studies, where the analysis starts within the data, instead of applying a hypothesis or theory upon a researched topic, which enables a deeper understanding and an increased possibility to find new knowledge about social settings (Oktay, 2012). The approach also moves beyond description towards development of theoretical models which can help practitioners within the studied area to improve and develop their practice. By searching for connections and patterns between different factors and bring conclusions and explanation to the findings through applying or adapting existing theories, results are possible to use as guidelines for future practices and practitioners (Oktay, 2012). Since grounded theory focuses on the individual and its experiences, the results that are gathered is a re-construction of the reality (Charmaz, 2006). The information, or ‘stories’ as Charmaz (2006) calls the material collected, provide the research with particular points of view. The data is not to be considered as neutral information, since both interviewer and participants brings in different ideas and approaches. They also creates new impressions and ideas through the relationship that is created during the data collection; often an interview or observation situation (Charmaz, 2006).

3.1.2 Grounded theory in practice

Charmaz (2006) describes the aim to use Grounded theory for research as an approach that enables the researcher to understand the participants’ standpoints, the situation itself and the participants’ actions within the studied situation. The practice off grounded theory is usually divided into segments, where one of the more important steps is to code the gathered data (Charmaz, 2006). The coding process refers to the naming and division of data into segments;
by categorizes and summaries it is then possible to analyse and interpret the data. The coding is the phase when the collected data is defined, and it is explained what actually happens in the gathered material, which is the starting point in order to understand what the data actually means and shows (Charmaz, 2006).

3.1.3 Issues with Grounded Theory

When Grounded Theory is used in research, one important aspect to have in mind is the influence of the researcher within the process of coding. Language plays a major role in this phase, since the data collected does not reflect a neutral state of the reality, it is a result of language, meanings, views, values and the individual perspectives of both researcher and respondent (Charmaz, 2006). The codes and results that arises from this kind of research approach is coloured by the researchers views and interpretations while trying to understand the participants view (Charmaz, 2006).

4. Method

For this thesis a mix of methods has been used. An initial literature study was conducted in order to give background and establish a base for the thesis and understand current fields of studies of social media and society. The main research activity, however, involves semi-structured interviews with people who have been involved in GreenhackGBG in different ways, as well as online observations of GreenhackGBGs social media channels.

The thesis is based on the first trial year (2015) of the project GreenhackGBG, although some of the interviews brought up issues or comments reflecting upon the second ongoing year of GreenhackGBG (2016). Though this is not possible to get around, since it is an active project that is still ongoing. The study aims to reach deeper qualitative understanding of how communication of sustainability is possible to conduct through social media platforms and GreenhackGBG serves as the case here (Creswell, 2014). Even though a qualitative approach gives less generalizable results than a quantitative approach, this is considered useful since there already exists a quantitative evaluations of the project (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016). This thesis is thereby able to supplement those finding with deeper understanding and possible explanations to previous findings. The conducted quantitative evaluation of GreenhackGBG (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016) have served as a starting point for this thesis and the development of the questioners used during the interviews have been based on the gaps that are shown in the quantitative evaluation.

The quantitative evaluation (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016) showed gaps of knowledge concerning the experiences and efficiency of the initial year of GreenhackGBG. This thesis and its qualitative approach is used in order to fill in those gaps. Hopefully similarities and differences between project initiators’ and participants’ experiences and understandings of the project will be made visible. The study further aims to serve as a case that explores and explains how social media could be used for communication of sustainability issues and solutions. Finally, the qualitative approach in this research aims to contribute recommendations based on empirical findings that would be beneficial to implement in order to make GreenhackGBG even more efficient.
4.1 Why interviews?

Since this thesis aims to study the communication that takes place in the social media flows of GreenhackGBG, from the view of participants as well as project management, interviews have been the inevitable method to use. This in order to understand the experiences, reflections and what the project actually resulted in. And in order to understand how GreenhackGBG functions, how the communication have operated, semi-structured interviews with both project management and the receivers of the communication have been essential (Flowerdew and Martin, 2005). Even though the interviews don’t give generalizable or representative results for all participants, interviews makes it possible to understand how individuals experiences and makes sense of the project (Flowerdew and Martin, 2005). Important is also to consider the risk bias in the answers which has an impact on the final results of the thesis. Those who have been interviewed are individuals who voluntarily partook, they have also shown to have an initial interest of sustainability and environmental questions and issues. Thereby the results reflects the ideas and experiences of these individuals, and should not be seen as reflections of a general view on GreenhackGBG (Creswell, 2014). Since interviews are used as the main data gathering method the data gathering during the interview situations has been affected by both me as the researcher, the interview situation in itself, as well as the preconceptions and knowledge the interviewee have (Creswell, 2014; Flowerdew and Martin, 2005). Reflections concerning the data gathering, process and analysis will be considered later in the chapters about generalizability and reflexivity.

4.2 Why observations?

Since the aim is to understand the communication in GreenhackGBG, interviews with participants and project management have been the largest part of data gathering. Though, in order understand the experiences and thoughts considering the project, observations of the communication taken place has been a complementary approach in order to develop the interview guides as well as it has served as a complement in the phase of data processing. The combination of methods enables a broader understanding and results that includes different perspectives (Flowerdew and Martin, 2005; Larsen et al., 2009). In this thesis observations regards nethnographical observations (Kozinets, 2010), where reading and observations of the communication taken place in the social media platforms, by mainly reading posts and discussion threads, but also observe the amount of feedback posts get (e.g. likes, comments, and shares) have been done. Since GreenhackGBG is open for anyone, it is possible to read all posts at all platforms no matter if you are a subscriber of information or not. The observations has contributed to an increased overall understanding of GreenhackGBG and its communication activities online.

4.3 The process

The data collection have been conducted through qualitative semi-structured interviews, observations.

A total of 15 interviews with project participants were conducted, where each interview took approximately 45-60 minutes. Two of these interviews took place in Gothenburg during March 3-4 2016 and the rest of the interviews were conducted via telephone or Skype meetings. The interviewees have been divided into two sub-groups; Citizens and Bloggers,
based on their roles in GreenhackGBG. These groups will be explained more thoroughly in the chapter about the Participants.

Additionally, one group interview was conducted with four representatives from the core GreenhackGBG project group. This interview took place on March 4, 2016, at the Environmental Department in Gothenburg. This was an interview where my supervisor Maria Håkansson also partook in the role of a second interviewer. The group interview took approximately 2 hours and was a semi-structured interview.

All interviews were recorded and later on transcribed. Thanks to a possibility to get founding from a research platform all interviews have been transcribed by a transcription company. Notes were taken during the interviews as complementary material. The interviews were conducted in Swedish, and the transcriptions have not been translated in their full version. However, all the quotes used in this thesis have been translated from Swedish to English by the author.

4.3.1 Structure of interviews

The interview guides had different design based on the different interviewees who took part in the interviews (the respondent in the study are described in more detail below). The semi-structured interview was chosen since it gives opportunities to have a dialogue about the topic, as well as it allows themes to be raised that the researcher have not thought about (Larsen et al., 2009). Thereby semi-structured interviews is a reflexive approach that generates rich and detailed data (Flowerdew and Martin, 2005). The interviews with the people who have participated in the GreenhackGBG campaign (citizens and bloggers respectively) were based upon one interview guide, and the group interview with the project management of GreenhackGBG had a second interview guide. The interview guides (see Appendix I & II) where developed from initial themes that are supported by gaps found in the initial quantitative evaluation (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016). The interview guides had slightly different structures, although the general themes and the overall structure of the interviews were similar:

With the project management the interview was divided into the following categories:

1. GreenhackGBG and Sustainability/Sustainable Development
2. Content in the media platforms
3. Results - How the participants interacted with the content
4. Reflection of the results
5. Future of GreenhackGBG

In the interviews with the participants the categories were:

1. GreenhackGBG – How participants interpret the project
2. Social media use
3. Experiences/reflection of GreenhackGBG
4. Personal connection to Sustainability and Sustainable Development
5. Future of GreenhackGBG

These themes were considered fundamental to include in the interviews, since they would hopefully together give a rich overall picture of GreenhackGBG as well as the participants’ experiences and connection to the project.

4.4 Recruitment

As mentioned, I interviewed different groups of interviewees for my study, including citizens and bloggers who in some way have participated in the GreenhackGBG campaign, and the project management team who lead the campaign. The citizens and bloggers were recruited with help from the GreenhackGBG-project group through their social media feeds. An informative letter/interview where I briefly described the project/thesis was sent out, in which I asked for interested people to partake in an interview about their participation in GreenhackGBG. The letter was shared in all social media channels GreenhackGBG operate: Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and in a weekly e-mail information letter. In addition, I directly contacted a couple of individuals who had previously registered as willing to be part of a focus group evaluation during the autumn of 2015. Out of the interviewed citizens, three people had been part of the earlier focus group, which the evaluation of 2015 (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016) party is based upon.

The group interview involved four people employed at the Environmental Department who have different roles in GreenhackGBG project management. These individuals were interviewed together in a group interview, since they were interviewed as spokespersons of the project. These were approached with the help of my supervisor and evaluator who have had previous contact with the group.

4.5 Participants

In this thesis the GreenhackGBG project management as well as two different groups of participants have been interviewed. These will here be described in detail.

The participants have been divided into different sub-groups, one is the project management, and one are the followers of the project, who hereafter will be called ‘Citizens’. And the last are persons who have had a more active role in the project, and they will hereafter be called ‘Bloggers’. These interviews have taken place both on sight in Gothenburg March 3-4 2016, and then through phone or Skype meetings between March 10-April 4, 2016.

4.5.1 The GreenhackGBG management team

In the interview with the project management, all four interviewees are employees at the Environmental Department at the city of Gothenburg. This department have had the largest responsibility in/of the project this far. Representing the project during the interview was the head of the Environmental Department, the current Project manager of GreenhackGBG, the previous Project manager of GreenhackGBG and an employee at the Environmental Department who works with climate and energy and evaluates digital tools for communication towards sustainable development. These four were interviewed together at the Environmental Department in Gothenburg 4th of March 2016. In the findings section below, the members of this group will be referred to as “City 1, City 2...” when quoted.
4.5.2 Citizens

This group represents the citizens of Gothenburg who have partaken in GreenhackGBG as followers/participants of the social media platforms and/or partaken in seminars and/or been signed up for weekly e-mails about the project. This group represents the target group of the GreenhackGBG project during 2015, which has been citizens with a pre-existing interest for sustainability and environmental issues and questions.

**Interviewed citizens:**
- Students
- Retired
- Unemployed
- Employed
- Employed (at the city of Gothenburg)
- Maternity leave

**Job types:**
- Journalism
- Communication
- Systems development
- Economics
- Public agencies
- Architecture
- Environmental sciences

**Age groups:**
- 20-35: 6
- 36-50: 2
- 51+: 2
- Did not tell: 2

The representation of gender in this group could be considered as uneven: 10 women and 2 men. This aspect is developed later on in this chapter. When quoted this group will be called “Citizen 1, Citizen 2….”

4.5.3 Bloggers

This is a group of participants in GreenhackGBG, who in addition to following the project also have had the active role as bloggers. This is a role that several people employed at the city of Gothenburg have had, where they engage in a challenge connected to a theme (see examples below). They blog on the project homepage or uses the social media platforms to share their experiences with the citizens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avfallsfria Ada</td>
<td>Live zero-waste for one month, except for organic waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three bloggers who have been interviewed for this study are women.

When quoted this group will be called “Blogger 1, Blogger 2...”

4.5.4 Gender

The uneven gender-representation is nothing that easily would have been possible to affect. The participation in the interviews have been on voluntarily basis, after approaching all followers at all GreenhackGBG platforms the results are as shown. On the other hand one of the results that were shown in the quantitative evaluation (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016) was that the majority of the GreenhackGBG followers are women. In other words, this result could thereby be expected.

4.6 Anonymization

All interviews have been transcribed and anonymised. That was clearly stated before the interview took place, and is an active choice in order to get as open and honest answers as possible during the interviews (Flowerdew and Martin, 2005). The interviewees have been assured that their individual views on the project or their comments cannot be connected to them.

4.6.1 Consent form

Before the interviews took place, I either e-mailed a consent form to the interviewees to read and sign, or handed it directly to them if we met in person for the interview. The consent form (see Appendix III) contained information about the thesis, the project, why the study is made, how the data is gathered, how the data (interviews) will be processed and ethical concerns that would be taken into account. Interviewees were also informed that they have the right to not answer questions if they don’t want, and that they are allowed to end the interview if they don’t want to continue. The interviewees were asked to sign the form in order to consent their participation in the interview, and additionally tick in boxes whether they were willing to be recorded, with the assurance that recordings would be transcribed and anonymised.

Before every interview took place the respondent was reminded that the interview would be recorded, before it started. Some of the interviewees were not able to fill in the form and send it back, in those cases a consent was recorded orally before the actual interview started.

4.7 Processing the data

After interviewing, the next step was to transcribe the interviews in order to make it easier to analyse them. For this part of the project I was able to get funding from a research platform
that made it possible to have the transcriptions done by a transcription company. This made it possible to send interviews for transcriptions right when they were conducted, and continuously proceed with more interviews and the writing process.

Inspired by grounded theory the processing of the gathered data (now in written form in the transcriptions) was done through manual coding (Charmaz, 2006). This part of the process is where the collected data is organized into paragraphs or segments with assigning words or description (Creswell, 2014). This have been the major part of the data processing, since the data collected through semi-structured interviews is rich and have a high information content (Charmaz, 2006). The coding process was done through categorization of all segments in each and every transcribed interview, done by manual analysis of each paragraph of text, giving labels that represents what they are all about (Charmaz, 2006).

After the initial coding the next step was then to find connections between themes and link the findings in each interview to each other (Creswell, 2014). This was made by mind-mapping the interview coding, comparing the codes, and thereafter making visible themes and results. In this way, the analysis has been done bottom-up and been grounded in the data, taking its starting point in the themes, general thoughts, ideas as well as views that were brought up in the interviews.

Since Grounded theory analysis starts within the gathered data through the coding process, the approach enables the data to speak for itself without applying theoretical structures upon it. (Creswell, 2014). This approach has been useful for this case study, since the rich data collected is fully explored and worked through and gives qualitative analysis and results. This approach gives final results that hopefully comes useful for the GreenhackGBG project management group and future development of the project.

4.8 Reflexivity

According to Flowerdew & Martin (2005), reflexivity is essential because there is no ‘objective’ knowledge since all knowledge is mediated through the researchers’ lens, worldview and expertise. Thereby it is important to consider how personal background, gender, values, socio-economic status shapes the interpretations made during the study have had an impact on the results when doing qualitative research with interviews (Creswell, 2014). As Charmaz (2006) expresses it: “Our preconceptions may only become apparent when our taken-for-granted standpoints are challenged” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 67). Thereby, it is important to have a self-critical view on the conducted study and the data collected, since it has been affected by the researcher and is inevitably also translated into the results (Flowerdew and Martin, 2005). Since the Grounded theory approach is grounded in the data, the collected material, analysis, results and interpretations are coloured and shaped by the researcher (Charmaz, 2006). Thereby it is important in the role as researcher to be aware of those preconditions and strive to not force individual preconceptions on the data that is coded (Charmaz, 2006). So, although I as researcher in this project have tried to be as objective as possible, it is inevitable that the results are shaped and coloured by me, my visions and background.

4.8.1 The role of the researcher

When research is conducted and especially grounded theory is used as main approach, the role of the researcher is important to problematize. This because the research conducted, the
results and choices made are all affected by background and expertise (Flowerdew and Martin, 2005). Personal views, opinions and background have implications on how the research is conducted. Therefore reflexivity is important in the setting of Grounded theory, since it is an interpretative approach for research and the research is understood and studied, through the lens of the researcher, and his/her beliefs and feelings (Birks and Mills, 2011).

Also the interview situation is a situation influenced by hierarchical power structures, which possibly influences the results (Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2014; Flowerdew and Martin, 2005). Where participants may adapt their answers in relation to the interviewer. Since the participants knew what I study, Sustainable Development, there is a risk that interviewees bare that information in mind during the interview, and therefor possibly adapted their answers to the knowledge of my interest as the researcher (Creswell, 2014)

4.9 Generalizability

For this study 15 interviews with participants (bloggers and citizens) have been conducted. Since the thesis is based on qualitative data, the results will not be generalizable, which is also not the purpose of the study (Flowerdew and Martin, 2005; Larsen et al., 2009). The results are not directly applicable to other context than the studied one. However, during the interview process I experienced a “saturation” in the collected data, where similar or even the same experiences and thoughts from citizens started to emerge. I saw this saturation in the data as a sign that the number of interviews was enough, given the time frame of this project. Rather than generating generalizable insights, the results are intended to give an increased understanding of GreenhackGBG, with results and solutions that are applicable on the specific case. The results are considered to increase the understanding of the complexity of social media as a tool for communication within a municipal project, but not give general knowledge about the research field.

5. Results

This section is divided into themes that have emerged during the coding process.

First the different actors that have been interviewed will be briefly introduced. Thereafter an overview of GreenhackGBG and the social media platforms that are used will be presented, as well as ideas about communication of sustainability in social media.

Citizens’ view on GreenhackGBG will be an own topic, where the role they have as either participants of the project or receivers of information is brought forward. Also the importance of personality in the content and communication is part of this.

Thereafter GreenhackGBG as a municipal project as well as the importance of tone in the communication will be presented. The next topic will thereafter be context and the overall level of the content. Also norms, with social media as a social sphere and quality of life are presented.

Last results are based on the use of social media, and the creation of involvement; with focus on how to involve people without an initial interest.

In the results that follow below, all citations and quotes from the conducted interviews have been translated from Swedish to English by the author. As mentioned earlier, depending on
their categories, the study participants will be referred to below as City 1-4, Citizen 1-12, Blogger 1-3.

5.1 The interviews

5.1.1 Project management

When the project management is asked to describe GreenhackGBG it is presented as a project developed with the goals of the Environmental program of Gothenburg as guidelines (“Göteborgs Stads Miljöprogram 2013”, n.d.). During 2010-2011 a smaller sustainability project called “Leva Livet”, translated to “living life”, was initiated, which was a project that aimed to change and make the life of 10 families in Gothenburg more sustainable through various themes and challenges. The idea of a larger project that would involve more citizens of Gothenburg was developed since “Leva Livet” was considered to be too selective in its measures and the project management acknowledged; Gothenburg needed to do more and reach more citizens in order to have a broader impact on the future of the city (City 3). For the initial trial year of GreenhackGBG during 2015, the project management made an active choice to promote the project towards a specific group in Gothenburg; citizens in the age group 25-45, with a pre-existing interest for environmental issues and sustainability (City 1; City 3).

To develop Leva Livet the initial idea was to create a project surrounding the measuring tool called “Svalna” (Svalna, 2016, n.d.). This was planned to be an easy to use measuring tool, (software) to calculate CO2 emissions in individual everyday life activities. As of spring 2016, the tool is still being developed and has therefore not been possible to launch to the public, but according to the project management group it will be a complementary tool for GreenhackGBG in the future (City 1). In order to launch the project in time, start in January 2015, GreenhackGBG was developed as the solution. This since the efforts to make Gothenburg a more sustainable city should not stand still because of delays in the development of initial software (City 1).

As of spring 2016, the project is still in constant change and development, since it is a pioneering project where no definite answers about how communication and the project should be managed are available. As the City express the role of GreenhackGBG;

*We know that the citizens have to be part of it, if we want to reach our goals. We know that, the industry must pitch in (...)... and this [GreenhackGBG] is the large effort we do at the moment in order to reach the citizens. We don’t know if this is the right way, but we have to do it, and that they [citizens] are important, that’s something we know for sure (City, 4)*

The goal is that the project will continuously develop and adapt the content and structure of communication, based on experiences and gained knowledge. GreenhackGBG aims to inspire other cities or organizations to do projects of similar manners, as one team member points out:

*We do not claim territory, Greenhack do not have to be GBG, it could be something else (City 3).*

GreenhackGBG is according to the city, not a copyright project, where GreenhackGBG is the only possibility. During the interview the project management clarifies that even though the name of the project today is connected to Gothenburg that does not have to be the case in the
future. The idea is that even more Greenhack-cities could be a solution and important step towards a more sustainable Sweden (City 3). GreenhackGBG intends to be a pioneering and ground breaking project that inspire other people, cities or organizations to apply the same ideas or get inspired by this project to do something adapted to their own setting.

But as City 2 emphasizes, the long-term goal is that GreenhackGBG will make itself unnecessary. The goal is that the city of Gothenburg will be a sustainable city, and therefore the over all, long term goal is that Gothenburg as a sustainable city would not need GreenhackGBG anymore.

5.1.2 Bloggers

During 2015 Greenhack had 6 bloggers, who each focused on a specific theme, correlating to the GreenhackGBG theme of the month. The 3 bloggers who have been interviewed are all employees at different administrative departments in the city of Gothenburg. The bloggers have been in charge of the GreenhackGBG homepage blog and in some cases also for the Instagram account. Some of the bloggers have developed alter-egos during their time as guest-bloggers.

One statement by one of the bloggers clearly describes the experience and the positive effect participating in GreenhackGBG

*It is a great honour to be able to accept a challenge and gain a lot of knowledge considering sustainable lifestyles during my working hours, and further also be able to apply that knowledge in my private life* (Blogger 2).

Common experiences discussed by these bloggers, is amongst others, that the blog at the homepage been the least successful online platform to encourage dialogue since it was not possible to see how many citizens followed or read the posts, and it was not possible for readers to comment. Instagram on the other hand have been perceived (by those who used it) as a platform where it was possible to get in contact with the citizens, but also it is a platform where instant feedback from citizens was possible to get.

Although the majority of the statements and discussions considering GreenhackGBG have been based upon the experiences as bloggers, some of the experiences and comments are connected to their private lives and as participants of GreenhackGBG on a private level. Therefore, they have not only contributed as their role as bloggers, but also as citizens. However, for the sake of simplicity, they will be referred to as “Bloggers” hereafter.

5.1.3 Citizens

Citizens are defined as the group of followers, participants or users that the GreenhackGBG project is aimed to target. A general high interest in sustainability and environmental questions, a high awareness and a lot of knowledge characterize this group. Something that is important to keep in mind regarding the study findings is that the majority of the citizens interviewed are already conscious and have an awareness incorporated in their everyday life and the choices they make on a regular basis.

How this group of people have come in contact with GreenhackGBG differs, some of them had seen information on Facebook and others follows similar accounts on Instagram and found GreenhackGBG through those. Other citizens have found GreenhackGBG through
friends and family, or through their work. The majority of the citizens follows GreenhackGBG on either Facebook or Instagram, and a couple of them just get information through the monthly e-mail, but of these a majority also use the homepage as a complementary source of information since they are interested in getting more information than the e-mail provides.

Some of the citizens interviewed did not know that GreenhackGBG is available on Facebook, even though they follow GreenhackGBG on Instagram. However, all citizens in the study are aware of the homepage.

This is a group of people who have voluntarily taken part as interviewees’ and have shown an interest for the project. The commitment confirms that this group has an interest in sustainability and environmental questions beyond their own sphere. All citizens have shown their support and interest for the project beyond just taking part of the communication that takes place in the social media platforms through GreenhackGBG, but to also help and develop the project as such through their participation in these interviews.

Shared opinions and values that emerged during the interviews were that even though the citizens to a certain extent criticize some aspects of GreenhackGBG, the underlying experiences and opinions of the project are positive. Regardless of whether the interviewees were positive or critical to GreenhackGBG in their interviews, it was clear that they all genuinely wanted to contribute with their feedback to improve and strengthen GreenhackGBG.

5.2 Communicate sustainability in social media

GreenhackGBG aims to promote and create changes through social media that will contribute in the process towards a more sustainable Gothenburg. As mentioned in the description of the project, GreenhackGBG is one attempt to address challenges related to involving citizens, as outlined in the city of Gothenburg’s climate programme.

5.2.1 Sustainability

GreenhackGBG is a sustainability project initiated by the city of Gothenburg, with a broad scope on sustainability where changes on an individual level is promoted. It is a project that aims to be where the target group, the citizens of Gothenburg, are: on the Internet. The choice to use social media as the main tool for the communication has been a strategic choice, since internet use and social media today is an integrated part of many people’s life. It’s considered to be an easy-going tool that enables communication adapted to how people live their lives and how people to a large extent get in touch with each other and take part of information and news today.

One of the bloggers discussed the sustainability aspect of GreenhackGBG in relation to the definition of sustainable development that the Brundtland-report stated in 1987 (“Our common future, 1987”, n.d.). Since GreenhackGBG is a project that strives towards a sustainable future for the city, this person reflects upon the meaning of sustainability as something very difficult to make concrete:
But what is a need? Most needs are created. It is really tricky. Sure, we have basic need of food, sunlight, rest, community, but what do we really need? (...) many of our needs we have already fulfilled, so, what do we really need today? (Blogger 1).

This is a reflection important to consider in a project like GreenhackGBG: how is sustainability defined, what is the goal of the project and what are the methods used to reach those goals? The question the blogger raises is also interlinked to the aim of the project, which is to make changes in everyday life and activities of the citizens. Although it is stated that the changes should be managed without any impact on quality of life, which is something that I will return to later on.

At the same time as sustainability is difficult to define, sustainability is a way to pitch a company or organization in order to strengthen sales or increase market shares, or elevate the reputation, as one citizen expresses below sustainability is considered to be a valuable quality for a company, organization or city to brand themselves through since, as citizen 8 explains it; sustainability is considered to be a strong sales pitch. This is closely connected to the city of Gothenburg, where GreenhackGBG is a clear and tangible project that both promotes sustainability, as well as promotes the city as a sustainable city. Since the aim with the project as part of the larger Climate Programme of the city is to make Gothenburg into a pioneering city that inspires other cities to become as sustainable, it gives Gothenburg a push as well as it possibly also improves the reputation of the city.

5.2.2 The communication

When it comes to the actual communication within GreenhackGBG, social media have been a natural choice as platforms for communication, since GreenhackGBG aims to reach the citizens through current communication techniques. Social media are today a large part of many people’s everyday life, therefore the choice to use those channels to get in contact with the citizens is an advantage that utilizes the current trends and structures of society. Chosen social media platforms are based on the current trends and a pre-existing idea of where the target group are and how that group could be reached easily:

Everyone’s on Facebook, it is a huge platform, a lot of people are part of. It was self-evident, and Instagram I don’t really remember how it was chosen, but it has proven to be an extraordinary platform for interaction with the participants. There we have been able to create discussions. And that is what we want, to create committed participation. (City 1).

Results are visible, some of the social media platforms used have shown better results than expected, with larger numbers of followers, and further also more active participation. The clearest example of this, which both city and the bloggers, as well as the citizens acknowledges is Instagram. It is considered to be the liveliest and most exiting social media feed of the GreenhackGBG social media feeds. Coinciding with the surprisingly positive results of Instagram, Facebook on the other hand has surprisingly been the platform both participants and the city has experienced as more difficult to use, although the city initially thought Facebook was the self-evident choice of social media. The results show that the citizens experiences Facebook as less attractive concerning content and therefore less attractive to follow, like or comment. The city recognizes these differences between the two platforms, and explains that it has had an effect on the GreenhackGBG project outcomes:
Instagram, we have been able to get to a good place, we are where we want to be. But, we are not there on Facebook it is significantly harder to enable that kind of participation. The amount of comments is generally low. (City 2)

The initial thought was that Facebook was the natural social media to use, but experiences shows that the strategies used for Facebook this far have not been as efficient as they could, and have therefore not resulted in the kind of dialogue and participation as desired. Facebook, as one of the more common social media today, have shown to be much more difficult when it comes to create activity and participation in the GreenhackGBG project. This, although the structural foundation of Facebook with functions and qualities could create a high level of dialogue and discussions. Why these results are shown in the case of GreenhackGBG will be brought up later on in the results section, as well as discussed thoroughly later on.

5.3 Participants’ view of GreenhackGBG

When citizens where asked to define GreenhackGBG, various definitions were given, such as;

* A project that creates curiosity, first and foremost it raises environmental and sustainability question in a simple and substantial way, in order to create a turn of opinion in the city (Citizen 5)

* An initiative with the aim to use unconventional paths. To inspire by new methods (Citizen 4).

* GreenhackGBG inspire citizens to an environmental friendly and sustainable lifestyle. (Citizen 1).

Although citizens generally described GreenhackGBG in positive manners as seen above. Greenhack is seen as a pioneering project that approaches citizens through new methods. Citizens experience GreenhackGBG as inspiring and as a project that could contribute to changed attitudes and turn opinion concerning how life is lived in Gothenburg. Although citizens describes the project in positive manners and sees it as a good initiative that they appreciates, one comment that frequently appeared amongst the citizens who took part of the interviews was that they did not know whether or not they could consider themselves to be participants of GreenhackGBG. There seems to be a lack of clarity concerning what taking part and what it really means to be a participant of GreenhackGBG. The citizens feel that the information GreenhackGBG shares and provides through social media does not have a clear enough aim, because it is not easy to know as a recipient what you are expected to do with the information. As a result, several of the citizens feel unsure if they are part of the project or not. The citizens have actively said that they are interested in taking part in discussions and evaluations about GreenhackGBG, but still several of these are not sure if they could consider themselves as participants of the GreenhackGBG campaign. One reason for this will be discussed later on.

One citizen stresses the way GreenhackGBG communicates sustainability as really important. A positive approach is according this citizen crucial in order to encourage change to happen:

* If you begin by criticising people, they get defensive. The only way to make people change is to switch approach and encourage them in what they do: ”what do we do well?”, ”What are we good at?” (Citizen 11)
The same person thinks that this is something that GreenhackGBG does well, but that it could be utilized even more in the project, since social media is a channel where positive encouragement could be used more than it is today in general, including in GreenhackGBG.

Citizens as well as the bloggers acknowledges the positive aspects social media brings into the project. The use of social media enables the project to approach people in their everyday life, and become a part of everyday activities since they can enter the private sphere of the citizens. This is also something that is acknowledged by the project and how the communication is structured – changes towards more sustainable lifestyles are presented as aspects that are adaptable to the everyday life of individuals. The everyday level is something Citizen 4 also claims as important, in order to create changes that citizens are interested in adopting as well as continue with in the long run.

*Social media are people’s everyday life and to stay at an everyday level is a must.* (Citizen 4)

This is a true balancing act for the project management; the amount of information in social media is really high, with a constant buzz of information constantly trying to get the attention from individuals. Ideally, even if GreenhackGBG successfully reaches an individual, the information has to be able to influence and motivate the receiver, so this person takes that knowledge and implements it into his/her life.

### 5.3.1 A receiver of information or a participant of a project?

As mentioned before, even though the majority of the citizens are positive towards the project many raise questions considering what the aim of the project is and what the citizens are supposed to do with the information they get. And even more importantly, why they should get involved and in that case what kind of involvement that would mean.

*I think it’s difficult to know what their dream is that I should do. Should I send in a picture and say ”this is what I do... now I’m really great at environmental... recycling” (...) they could be clearer with what they are... Do they want anything else than to just inspire?* (Citizen 1)

Although the city has a clear picture of what they want to communicate, the reality is that many of the citizens’ experience the aim as unclear. Communication takes place and a lot of information and themes are brought up within the range of sustainability, still, there is a mismatch between the messages the city believes that they are communicating, and how these are received by the citizens:

*I don’t think that they present any clear picture, it is rather various people who presents their individual definitions of sustainability. I have not understood what they imply with sustainability as a concept in this project.* (Citizen 7)

*What they want. Yes, what is their message? They haven’t written that much about it on their homepage.* (Citizen 9)

Furthermore, there are also citizens who sees the good-will in the project, but still they have not personally been affected by it, as Citizen 9 says below:

*I think the things they do... its good. But, I have probably not done that much differently. GreenhackGBG haven’t been my trigger* (Citizen 9).
So even though there is a lot of information and challenges, those who have been the target group this far have not necessarily been affected that much, or done that much differently, which could be connected to the fact that many of the citizens already do the things promoted on an everyday basis.

Still the question if the citizens’ are receivers of information or participants of the GreenhackGBG project withstands. Some of the citizens have expressed that they have a feeling that the project has a clear hierarchical top-down structure in the communication, where the city is on the top of the pyramid, and the citizens are supposed to adapt to the messages and information the city spreads and wants the citizens to do. One citizen argues that the project seems to focus more on information spreading in order to persuade citizens to do the changes, rather than discuss the issues and include the citizens in the process. As Citizen 8 expresses it, there is to a certain extent a lack of togetherness:

*It would have been better if Greenhack had created a feeling of belonging, a feeling that “we do this together” and ”we do it together, towards the same goal” (...) at the moment it’s more like “we inform you, you are down there, you listen to what we do, and then you should do it”* (Citizen 8)

This is an important reflection from the participant since GreenhackGBG is a project that according to the management aims to communicate with the citizens and not towards the citizens, and therefore this experience is an example of when the participants’ experiences of GreenhackGBG do not match the initial vision of the project.

5.3.2 Personality

The importance of personality and possibility to connect to real people who adopts challenges and changes or shares their knowledge is clear. When GreenhackGBG was initiated in 2015 January and February as he first months of the project showed stable amounts of visits at the homepage (see table 2), but then in March there was a major increase. This increase is explained both as a result of a stabilization of the project and more attention, in combination with the theme of the month which was consumption and waste which has proven to be one of the more popular themes. Also, during March the blogger; Avfallsfria Ada (“Waste-free” Ada) was introduced. March was the first month an alter-ego was used as a communication approach, and that proved to be successful and gave a first indication of the effects of personality and a personal in the communication have on the amount of followers and the extent of participation in GreenhackGBG (City 1; City 2.). This approach have also shown to be appreciated by citizens, where more than half of the interviewees have mentioned Avfallsfria-Ada as an inspiring guest.

Similarly as the city acknowledges the importance of personality in the communication, also the citizens does. The communication structure is one theme that is reflected upon; what is communicated and how that communication is done has a major impact on how the information is received.

*It feels exclusive* (Citizen 12)

The quote by Citizen 12 is how that citizen describes GreenhackGBG on Instagram and why Instagram is the platform this person follows GreenhackGBG on. Exclusive is said in the sense that the tone of the communication in combination with guest-instagrammers gives the
platform a feeling of exclusivity and makes it more attractive to follow. The communication strategy with weekly guests on Instagram is something a majority of the citizens who uses Instagram says to appreciate since the shared posts have a better and more attractive approach than other GreenhackGBG social media feeds. Both citizens and the management are positive to the communication structure on Instagram, since it engages more people and these interacts with the content to a larger extent. The statistics also confirm this, the amount of likes and comments connected to the messages that are posted on Instagram is higher than those postings that are made on Facebook. One reason to this difference in participation between the media platforms could be traced to the communication that takes place. As the project management acknowledges:

*On Instagram it is always individuals, and I think that lowers the bar and invites more people to the discussions. When we share things at Facebook we are the project.* (City 2)

The majority of the interviewed citizens also see Instagram as the more attractive social media channel used by GreenhackGBG. As Citizen 5 describes:

*I think Instagram is less formal, so to say. Though, it is not super-informal either, but in some cases they have a better tone in the communication. And pictures of course, that’s really nice!* (Citizen 6)

The informal tone has been discussed by other citizens as well since it is an aspect that gives GreenhackGBG a less municipal/agency tone in the communication which is considered as a positive quality. The tone of the communication is an aspect that will be further developed in the next part, where the role of GreenhackGBG as a municipal project is brought forward.

### 5.4 A municipal project

GreenhackGBG is a municipal project founded by the city of Gothenburg. This is an aspect that influences the implementation and how the project is managed, what resources the project have and how the actual communication is structured.

One major aspect that GreenhackGBG has to have in consideration is the survival of the project. It is a project funded by tax-money, and therefore it depends on political decision-making. In order to grant funding for upcoming years there is a need to show positive results. It is a big challenge for the project how to measure participation and also when and how it is possible to see whether or not GreenhackGBG is a succeeding project. In order to proceed and ensure a future of GreenhackGBG the project management have to show positive results in order to enable funding.

*The big challenge is to deliver results, since in the end it is the politicians who decides what we will do in 2017. It is a battle against time, we have resources now, but we don’t know what we have next year* (City 1)

Also one of the bloggers raises this issue of how difficult it is to know what effects the project will have, and whether or not the communication taken place in the online environment is successfully translated into an offline environment.

*Then, if they [citizens] actually take the step from listening to doing something, we don’t know. It’s really hard to measure. The amount of forces that influences society to do the
opposite is unbelievably high. So it’s difficult to know. Yet, that the city at least tries to reach out is really positive (Blogger 1).

This situation is not different compared to other tax funded projects as there has to be positive results to show in order to continue. The difficulty with GreenhackGBG lays in the use of social media, since the use of social media platforms makes measuring and compilation of results difficult. GreenhackGBG is a pioneering project, constantly developing, and thereby not even the project management have clear answers to what works or not. The project management do not know how the results should be measured or if there are efficient tools to measure participation or show results when it comes to social media.

Thus, this project is a learning process for us, we learn every day, what works and what don’t. (City 1)

It is not just within the city of Gothenburg this is a pilot project, it’s on a national basis. (…)

Others looks at us and are curious about what we do with this project and how it develops. (City 2).

Citizens also show concern for the project, based on the awareness that it is a municipal project, as expressed below by Citizen 11. At the same time this quote shows how important a project like GreenhackGBG can become locally to its participants:

Yes, the only thing I think, is that I hope that they continue. That this is not just another project that becomes nothing (...) I hope that Greenhack knows that even if you don’t really understand everything they say, you still appreciate the project since they spark ideas and thoughts (Citizen 11).

5.4.1 Tone of the communication

The city of Gothenburg is an actor who has the responsibility to exercise authority, which can become challenging to balance with a project like GreenhackGBG that initially aims to communicate on a down-to-earth level. Social media is connected to straightforward communication that is easy to use and where it is easy to approach a broad range of receivers. The challenge is to find a balance between the authoritarian role the city has and at the same time embrace the easy-going and personal approach and tone in communication taking place in social media. According to citizens a personal tone is the most attractive approach, and therefore also most efficient to use in social media in order to attract participants and encourage change. In similar manners one of the bloggers reflects upon the task to be a guest-blogger and undertake a challenge:

I think some challenges have reached out and inspired people, and I think it is easier to relate to a person who adopts a challenge. And that is probably one method to use when [trying to] reach out to those who don’t care that much about sustainability issues today (Blogger 2)

Some citizens means that they experience GreenhackGBG as a city implemented project. At the same time there are citizens who have complete opposite experience. Either way the project is perceived, it has an impact on the citizens’ experiences of the project: how, when and what is communicated by GreenhackGBG is experienced in various ways depending on the individual thoughts about the project.
I’m not just thinking ”wow, this has to be the city of Gothenburg who operates this project”, it takes a while before you get that. And that’s something good. (Citizen 12).

As a result of these divisions’ shows, some citizens experience and express similar aspects in completely different ways. One citizen expressed that postings, especially on Instagram, are pretty weird when they appear in the middle of the night, since it does not correspond to the idea of what, how and when a city-managed project should communicate. Taking the opposite standpoint, another citizen saw issues with the fact that many of the GreenhackGBG pages on different platforms “sleeps” during evenings, weekends and holidays. Since social media never sleeps, GreenhackGBG is experienced by that citizen as a very municipal project, which is only active during office hours and thereby lose some of the values social media could bring into the project, if utilized efficiently.

These two opposite experiences illustrate aspects GreenhackGBG should examine closer. How clearly and in what way does the city and the municipal aspect influence what GreenhackGBG is and could be? Does that correlate to the view participants have on the project? And thirdly, does the communication strategies of today correspond to the vision the city have?

5.5 Importance of context in the communication

Many of the citizens bring up the importance of context as something that needs to be developed and used more in the project and communication. Although there are different opinions about GreenhackGBG, citizens who have been interviewed sees the project as an important and good project. The motivations differ amongst the participants and the expressed opinions seems to be different at first glance, though, the main messages in the expressed opinions usually ask for similar changes. A clear example of this is the wish to have a higher degree of contextualization, where the desire amongst the citizen is the same, but the reasons why they want it differs.

Some of the citizens believes that the general level of information communicated is too low, and the communication of issues, sustainability challenges and solutions lacks context. Therefore, some citizens think that the solutions promoted by GreenhackGBG would benefit from a thorough contextualization, since a contextualization would deepen the understanding and thereby offer a possibility to be challenged even more.

I would like to bring the project up a notch, to what happens in (...) But you would like to hear more about ongoing debates, or what happens on a national level (Citizen 3).

At the same time, a clearer context and explanation to why the citizens should adopt changes or tempt to accept challenges promoted by GreenhackGBG would not only broaden scope of sustainability, but it would also contribute to more clarity and explanation – as one citizen states:

“If people don’t understand what you say, then words are just words” (Citizen 4)

The information spread in GreenhackGBG and especially the promoted challenges are experienced as decoupled from the larger context of issues. As Citizen 4 said, as seen above, the importance of connection to a larger perspective as a way to explain, has a huge impact on the outcomes. If the challenges, information and solution are communicated without a larger
context, then the words risks to be just words. If they would be promoted within a larger context, then the probability that the receivers would understand the message is enhanced.

Citizens also means that a deeper understanding through contextualization would further explain why they should listen and adapt to the messages and challenges. According to the project management this is something that they are aware of, but citizens wish it would be part of the project even more. A deeper awareness and a broader understanding of the existing issues and the interconnectedness between these as well as their connection to the larger global scale would bring explanation to the importance of making changes which would make the process to change easier. A contextualization would also bring the individual closer to the global context, and thereby the effects of individual activities and what effects a change or adaption would have on sustainability issues on a larger scale would be easier to understand.

That is something that GreenhackGBG lacks. Greenhack focuses only on the individual and not what the individual could do to help solve the larger issues. And that is something I think is a shortage in Greenhack. It’s something for those who are already convinced (Citizen 12)

Citizens similarly claim that more contextualization would make it easier to understand why he/she should make the promoted changes. A broader context would increase the knowledge of sustainability issues and how the individual efforts can have an impact on the larger scale. In other words, both city and citizens acknowledges the need of contextualization based on the same grounds. Citizen 6 problematizes a lack of context when communicating sustainability and what the effects of that could be:

It could calm people down, into the feeling "yes, but..." That you already do some of the things, and then you feel pleased and proud, like I also do. I walk around and feel a little bit satisfied with myself, since I do some of the things endorsed. And then you possibly miss out on those things that are truly relevant in a global context (Citizen 7)

The GreenhackGBG project is today experienced by a majority of the citizens as a project for those who are already convinced. It focuses on communication towards those with a pre-knowledge and pre-existing interest for environmental and sustainability issues. And the lack of context is a factor that risks to decrease the probability that not-committed citizens would partake the project, since the lack of connection to a larger context thereby don’t explain why it is important. A contextualization would also empower those who are already engaged since it could strengthen the activities those individuals already do, to continue doing it.

In connection to the wish of more contextualization is the ideas that GreenhackGBG could connect the communication and challenges even more to the city of Gothenburg. By involving the citizen, and the city itself could increase the feeling of community and togetherness. As citizen 6 expresses it:

Greenhack could highlight things participants/other citizens do. They could have... I don’t know, but since they have a challenge of the week, they could choose a picture of the week, showing what citizens have done and posted in social media in connection to this challenge (...) I want to see what the citizens of Gothenburg does. (Citizen 6)

The positive effects of a connection to Gothenburg is highlighted as a possibility to utilize the positive qualities local connection and patriotism could bring into the project. GreenhackGBG could thereby serve as a contributor in order to strengthen the connection amongst citizens,
companies and organizations. By including more personality and local connection could thereby also contribute to an increase of the internal pride within Gothenburg connected to GreenhackGBG.

5.6 Norms

Within GreenhackGBG a strong majority of the interviewed citizens have a pre-existing interest for sustainability and environment. Many of the interviewees are aware that they have non-normative ideas and ways of life, and already engage in activities that are considered as the goals/promoted solutions by GreenhackGBG as part of their everyday life. In other words; the norm of sustainability GreenhackGBG shares and spreads through the campaign in Gothenburg is already part of the everyday life of the participants. Many citizens claims that GreenhackGBG is a project that they support, although the information, challenges and the project as such has not contributed to any tangible changes in their lives. This is shown as citizen 9 explains how GreenhackGBG contributes to the willingness to keep up with a sustainable lifestyle;

*Maybe I have not done anything more because of GreenhackGBG, but I have opened up...continued with the things I already do, so to say.* (Citizen 10)

Although the goal with GreenhackGBG is to create change, influence attitudes, behaviour and the norms amongst the citizens in a long perspective, it is easier said than done. Since the current norms and societal structures promotes other ways of life and not the same sustainability as GreenhackGBG does, it is difficult for project as well as citizens to truly adapt their lives.

*We live in a society and structure. You are able to choose to remove or change certain things in life. But other aspects are you stuck with, in the broader perspective...* (Blogger 1)

However, even though changes are promoted and individuals adapt to those changes or remove certain things or activities in their everyday life, some aspects are impossible to affect and this is an aspect citizens have pinpointed.

*I am aware of environmental issues, but it is so to say a constant struggle between different norms and wishes* (Citizen 5).

Also citizen 11 criticised the project since it lays the responsibility to change upon the citizens. Citizen 11 means that a project that GreenhackGBG fights in an uphill battle. The largest gains would be able to get if efforts were put on largescale structural changes, which would guide citizens into the right direction. As it is today the adaptions citizens are promoted to do and to live non-normative, makes life more difficult since it demands more efforts from the individuals. As citizen 11 pointed out, when a person decides to live his/her life in a way that is not the norm it takes more effort than living within the societal structures and norms would take. Although, Citizen 8 believes that the city has a huge responsibility in order to create changes. And means that GreenhackGBG serves a great importance for change processes since the communication about sustainability increases the awareness and hopefully also strengthens the willingness and courage to do something that is not in accordance to the current norms;

*Greenhack is an incredibly important part in order to increase the acceptance of changes in society (...) so citizens accept changes easier. That is an important part of the responsibilities*
of a city, not only make sure the changes are applied and accepted, but also make sure the citizens find them important. (Citizen 9).

5.6.1 Level of the communication

As seen a majority of the interviewed citizens already do more than what the project communicates and requests, which is something that is both criticized by some as well as pointed out as a positive aspect of the project. The city explains the level of the information as follows:

*We should have a mixture, there has to be everything, from really low thresholds for those who don’t do anything today, but also pretty tough challenges for those who already does a lot. And we try to retain that idea, to have the mixture, in order to reach out to more people.* (City 2)

This claim is a bit contradictory, since the project management stated earlier that GreenhackGBG during 2015 would focus on those who already are involved and interested, since that would be an easier start for the project. But according to this statement above, there is an aim to approach citizens with different levels of pre-knowledge. This is something that could explain why the project this far have been experienced as not really reaching neither the target group nor those who have not been engaged before on a broad scale. The communication that have taken place this far in GreenhackGBG could be claimed to be a middle ground between those who are engaged and those who are not, and therefore not be challenging nor easy enough in order to attract more participants. In other words; to attract both groups’ demands different approaches and types of communication strategies.

GreenhackGBG encourages individuals as well as other participants to implement changes through challenges and these attempts are experienced by citizens as efficient tools to put positive pressure upon participants:

*I think it is really interesting with the challenges and promises; you could feel that “this is something I want to do or think about”, or just feel a pressure that “No, you have to think about this. There are other people how thinks about it, and now you are one of those who don’t”* (Citizen 1).

*Something I think GreenhackGBG have done really well is that... it feels easy, the challenges have been easy and makes you... you think, ‘okay, I’ll try it’* (Citizen 12)

But on the other hand there are participants today who have the completely opposite experience of the information level. Since the initial year is targeted towards a group who is considered as people with a pre-existing interest and knowledge.

*Some things they inform how you should do, but they use a complicated vocabulary so I don’t understand what they mean (...) they seem to take for granted that those who reads this have a pre-knowledge, a basic knowledge about sustainability and environment* (Citizen 11)

The quote by citizen 11 shows the challenge that lays in a project that aims to promote information towards a whole city. Even though the initial trial year mainly focused on individuals with a pre-existing interest for sustainability, GreenhackGBG by using social media reaches out to a broader audience than just that target group. This aspect demands recognition of the different backgrounds, knowledge and attitudes that exists amongst those
who takes part of the information. Since citizen 11 experiences that the information is too complicated with use of difficult vocabulary, there is a risk that the project and communication as such pushes away those without the pre-existing knowledge, since they don’t understand or don’t feel included in the GreenhackGBG sphere.

5.6.2 Social media – a social sphere

Social media is considered to be an enabler of community development, since it connects people and creates arenas for those with similar ideas and world views to strengthen each other and create community. Social media is in other words defined as a social sphere online where interaction takes place and community develops. Thanks to the structure of social media it is a communication tool that easily connects people beyond time or space. However, when it comes to strategically utilizing social media, it is much more challenging. The tricky aspect is, as shown in previous chapter with the level of communication, to create a community that is able to attract and engage a broad range of people, both those who already have the interest and thereby find the community by themselves, but also to attract people/citizens who do not already have the interest. As Blogger 1 expresses this issue;

Research says that (…) in social media, you choose to follow those things you are already interested in. You follow those that confirm you own picture of the world (…) It is really difficult since there is an insane buzz of information, so it is really hard to reach through. (Blogger 1)

In other words, it is really important to put efforts to understand how to create a feeling of community that attracts those who do not already have an interest for the promoted value or case. As Blogger 1 explains it, you see what you want to see, and in social media people usually follows those or that information which confirms personal ideas, values and world views. This is something a citizen experienced as a clear issue, even though the communication is promoted towards the city and aims to include as much people as possible, the reality is that events as well as the social media feeds of GreenhackGBG attracts a homogenous group of citizens:

During the autumn, a theme day “Sluta snacka börja Greenhacka” (“Stop talking and start Greenhacking”). An event I think could attract a lot of people. But it felt like,…, it was a narrow group of people there. A homogenous group (…) and then I started to wonder how this had been advertised and spread, how did they communicate? Who did they want to reach?”(Citizen 12).

5.7 Quality of life

One of the ideas and aims expressed in the quantitative evaluation(“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016) is that GreenhackGBG is a project that through information and sharing of ideas would help citizens of Gothenburg to have more sustainable lifestyles and show how that goal is possible to achieve without any negative impact on the quality of life (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016). Though one important aspect and potential downfall is that there is no definition of what quality of life is from a GreenhackGBG perspective.

So what is then quality of life? Since it is a part of the project goal it is of great importance to have a clear definition of what quality is according to the GreenhackGBG norm, in order to
enable a common strive for that. And even more importantly is that citizens define quality in their own lives in accordance to the GreenhackGBG definition, in order to reach the goal together.

Different people have different ideas and experiences of what quality is within their lives. Therefore, one question is how GreenhackGBG sees that they promotes change, and therefore also what kind of change they actually encourages citizens to make in their lives. Based on the initial trial year of 2015, the majority of the citizens are very interested in questions concerning environment and sustainability. The choice to focus on a group with a beforehand interest in these questions is an active choice made by the project management group since this group is considered easier to get on-board in the initial stages of the process, when the project is still developing (City 3). On the other hand, this is something that could have implications on the possibility to use the experiences as guidelines for future development and expansion of GreenhackGBG towards other target groups of the city, since the experiences reflects the results GreenhackGBG have on an already interested target group.

One citizen talks about the positive impact GreenhackGBG have, even though the project do not contribute with challenges that really challenge the life of the citizen.

*It’s fun, I feel like, like we belong to the avant-garde without being aware of that from the start (...) I have not felt particularly radical. But then I read many of the challenges, then it feels like we do a whole lot of things right, within quotation-marks, right according to the “Greenhack-ideal”* (Citizen 7).

Based on what Citizen 7 says, the main aim with the campaign – to inspire people to make changes in their everyday life – is easily achieved since those are already part of the target group’s everyday lives. Further on, the reactions and reflections upon the challenges, suggested changes and information shared are thereby neither positive nor negative. Though important to reconsider in relation to this is that the results shown by the first year trial group reflects the experiences of an “already interested” group. Thereby it is important to question how feasible it is to use the idea that quality of life could be sustained, since not everyone have the same ideas of what quality in life is.

The idea to enable solutions that makes life more sustainable, simultaneously as quality of life would not be affected is a good idea when it comes to convincing citizens to make changes. The approach with small-scale changes is useful since it promotes easy adaptions to become more sustainable. This is a quality within GreenhackGBG that several citizens highlight:

*The more sacrifices you have to do, with renounce of aspects that you appreciate in life, the harder it gets. So, it has to be easy applicable challenges and solutions promoted* (Citizen 8)

In similar manners another citizen describes it as;

*I think all of these things, it does not have to be neither or. It’s good if you do something. And that is something I think is important to highlight. To not scare people away.* (Citizen 10)

The majority of the participants have a view on quality in life that could be considered as “appropriate”, based on how quality in life could be defined with a sustainability approach. A majority of the citizens’ talks about their ways of life as closely connected to those challenges and ideas GreenhackGBG promotes as sustainable choices. To a large extent citizens who participates in GreenhackGBG this far have a general awareness.
I do a lot on a personal level, and of course I could change even more, but somehow I think, if I really want to do something for the environment to promote sustainability, I should try to get more people involved (Citizen 8)

This is something this citizen sees as a positive effect of GreenhackGBG. It pushes the importance to do something. It acknowledges that there are people who in essence don’t do anything, and makes it clear how important it is to involve and influence those. At the same time as there are a lot of positive experiences and opinions considering the effects of GreenhackGBG, another important aspect is brought up by the citizens:

Why do they promote the project towards those who are already interested? Those who are not, are those who needs it the most (Citizen 4)

Many citizens perceive the project as addressed towards those who already are interested and concerned about sustainability. Citizen 10 questions why they chose this target group.

I feel like I’ve heard most of the things before. I’ve been thinking about these issues long before Greenhack. (Citizen 10).

The emerging feeling is that the information communicated by the project is nothing new. This issues possibly decreases the willingness amongst the participants to do more, since it doesn’t challenge those who already are involved. When challenges don’t challenge the citizens, then it is not surprising that the challenges are not done. The lack of clarity creates a confusion regarding whom this project is really targeting. On one hand the target group is supposed to be citizens with an initial interest, but a majority of these citizens who have the interest experience that the level of communication and challenges in GreenhackGBG are too low and therefore not directed towards them, as Citizen 10 continues:

Actually this (GreenhackGBG) is not for me, and I think that is the problem, those who are already convinced and on-board are those who takes part of it (Citizen 10)

In similar manners Citizen 12 says:

It is a really, really great idea, and I think the thought has been promoted for a long while. Though, I have my thoughts considering the target group, and how to reach out. So to say, reach more people who could get involved. (Citizen 12)

The project management group on the other hand explains this focus as an active choice since concentration on a group with a pre-existing interest would make the implementation of the project easier, and would require less resources

For the initial year of the project the main target audience was people aged 25-46, usually pretty used to social media, who have previous interest in sustainability. One reason is that this group needs less work since they so to say are already aboard. (City 3).

These are people who partly are active in social media; it is a group who shares information, and we wanted to get a broad distribution through engaged people, therefore we turned towards people with an interest of environment and sustainability questions. Not climate sceptics, since that would cost much more than those resources we had, we took the simpler path, so to say (City 3).
In other words the choice to direct the project towards a target group with an initial interest is an active choice by the project management. The idea was that an interested group would make the implementation of the project easier and demand less resources, both monetary and in work that has to be done.

5.8 Structure and use of social media platforms

The structure of the social media platforms sets a framework of what is possible to do in each platform. Both bloggers and citizens as well as the city acknowledge that the different platforms are not utilized with all the functions and possibilities they contain.

That’s what I thought the Facebook page was meant to do... instead they should have an informative page, as well as a group-page that you could join, and where the members together could encourage each other (Citizen 7).

The city explains that they do not really know how they should use the social media platforms in the most efficient way. They are in a development and evaluation phase, were the only way to know what or how to do things, and is by doing them. Trial and error and learn from mistakes and adapt the activities upon the gathered knowledge is the only way forward.

Social media, to use it at the environmental department as something completely new, we hadn’t worked with it before. So Greenhack became a pilot project for those kind of channels for the department. There were no routines, there were... we started from scratch. (City 3).

5.8.1 Utilization of Social media platforms

Social media as the main platforms for communication for GreenhackGBG. The choice to use social media platforms derives from the idea to initiate a public management project and take it where the citizens are (City, 1). This have both positive and negative effects on the project.

An important aspect is that social media today is a large part of many people’s everyday life. It is a social sphere were it is possible for individuals to get in contact with other people, but also in order to stay close to them, even though there could be a large geographical distance. And many participants acknowledge GreenhackGBG for their pioneering way of approaching the issues and to use social media in order to be where people are. Some of the comments regarding social media use for a project like this is that it becomes a good support in the everyday life, since it is such a simple way to be informed and take part of information (Citizen 1)

In the information flow of today it has to be difficult to reach out, and that is a large problem for the environmental movement in general. To reach out towards those who are not interested is difficult since they are busy with everything else in their life... but on the other hand it is important to be constantly reminded (Citizen 8)

Another opinion considering social media in general how easy social media makes communication Citizen 5 compares social media to other kind of communication. Calling someone by telephone demands a larger effort than sending someone a message on Facebook.

It doesn’t require the same effort, you could have a pretty nice dialogue. It’s not as serious” (Citizen 5)

5.8.2 Popularity
The reason why Instagram is popular is that the platform is easy to adapt to one's own settings. In other words, it's possible to see only the things you want to see. (Although there have been changes made in the Instagram functions in 2016, and today the structure is more similar to Facebook with trending themes and information flows based on likes etc.) Instagram is an efficient tool for information distribution for those who are already involved or have an interest in a specific topic.

Because of the different structure of Instagram, compared to Facebook, it's harder for a project like GreenhackGBG to engage new possible participants. Those who follow GreenhackGBG presumably follow other accounts with similar content, and therefore find GreenhackGBG. Instagram requires citizens to actively find and follow the account by themselves. This on one hand is a positive quality of Instagram, since it corresponds to the initial aim of the trial year of the project, which was to involve people with a pre-existing interest in sustainability. On the other hand, that could also be an issue for future expansion of GreenhackGBG, since the risk is that citizens who do not have the pre-existing interest will not actively search for the project. In these cases, the GreenhackGBG Instagram-account depends on the other social media platforms the project uses, such as Facebook, in order to attract new participants.

This is something that further could be a concern, since the GreenhackGBG Facebook-page is less popular by citizens today. Today the amount of re-posts, likes and comments is concern for the GreenhackGBG management. The reason could have various explanations, but a few different brought up by citizens are that they did not know that GreenhackGBG even existed on Facebook. Others said that they just don’t see the updates by GreenhackGBG in their information flow. And a third comment is that the information in the Facebook flow is not as inspiring or attractive as the communication is on Instagram. These are all crucial points to consider since the key to success in social media, especially in the case of Facebook, depends on the willingness to like, comment or even share posts (City 2).

The communication on Facebook is considered as less interesting and attractive, since it does not have the similar personal feel as Instagram has been able to develop. And this is possibly one part of the explanation to why GreenhackGBG struggles to involve more participation and sharing activities on Facebook. As Citizen 14 explains below:

*In order to have this "sharing-effect" ... I mean, make it a bit more exciting and hot, since...yes...since there are municipal vibes in it at the moment.* (Citizen 12)

The combination of a municipal tone and that Facebook is a platform where it is much more difficult to be seen. Since the flow of information is larger and built upon a different structure, where Facebook-users information flows are affected by what their networks/friends likes and shares. Although GreenhackGBG have made a couple of sponsored posts, which means to pay for an article or port to reach a larger community than only those who follows GreenhackGBG, positive effects were possible to see, but the city of Gothenburg does not accept purchases of services from Facebook (City 2). So therefore the potential Facebook services could generate, are not allowed for GreenhackGBG to use on a regular basis, since it is a project financed by tax-payers’ money.

Also brought up as an issue with Facebook is how it is utilized today. Facebook as a social media platform is an excellent way to reach out to a large public. But according to citizens the
information that is spread on Facebook is not as attractive or exiting as the more personalized approach that Instagram has adapted. The use of it is also criticised since GreenhackGBG still uses Facebook as a communication channel rather than a platform for discussions and creation of various forums. One citizen suggests that GreenhackGBG should create discussion groups or request followers to create groups underlying the GreenhackGBG group. There are a lot of forums/discussion groups today at Facebook, but this is something GreenhackGBG have not utilized in their Facebook existence.

Two of the bloggers experienced Instagram as a better platform for their activities, since the homepage-blog had a negative aspect built in the structure within the platform. The homepage-blog created difficulties to interact with the citizens/readers, since it doesn’t have any field for comments or any other opportunity to get immediate feedback or have interaction with those who read the posts. One big issue therefore is if the blog is not used in combination with other social media, then the blogger have no possibility to interact with his/her readers. On the other hand the bloggers experienced a lot of feedback in the offline environment from friends, co-workers and families who were in personal contact, but what other citizens thought, wondered or liked was not possible for the blogger to know.

5.9 How to involve those who aren´t into it yet?

In GreenhackGBG social media is considered to be an efficient strategic communication tool in order to reach out to as many citizens of the city as possible. During the first year the focus was to reach those who already are involved and have sustainability and environmental thinking as a part of their everyday life. Although, GreenhackGBG aims to include the whole city as a long-term goal.

As Blogger 1 said, we tend to follow those with similar interests in social media, and thus see those things that confirm our perception or view of the world. In other words, it is really challenging to reach out and be able to include more people into the project, especially if those don’t have the same mind-set concerning the initial aim of the project.

Since there are different opinions regarding the level of the information, challenges and the project it is really difficult to claim with certainty what solutions would be the best. It all depends on the receiver of the information and that the receiver hopefully has a wish to become more than a receiver; an active participant. The majority of the citizens today perceive themselves as environmental friendly, aware of issues connected to sustainability and already highly involved and engaged in questions regarding sustainability. Although there have been a couple of interviews with citizens who consider themselves to be “new” to these kind of questions. These have less pre-knowledge about issues connected to sustainability, and these are also those who experienced the project as too difficult from time to time.

It gets clear when it is possible to compare citizens, that those who express that they do not understand what the project is all about or what GreenhackGBG wants them to do, could easily drop off, or stop follow GreenhackGBG on social media and thereby care less about it. At the same time, when the information and challenges are considered as too easy and not challenging enough, that increases the risk that those who already are committed drop of the project, since they see GreenhackGBG as not being responsible enough considering sustainability issues. But still, the citizens who have been interviewed and raised these potential risks, have still stayed. They mean that they feel an attraction towards the topic and
the communication that takes place, even though they either don’t understand everything or whether challenges and the project provides “enough” information or not.

Somehow it seems like those who have an interest, no matter if they have a lot of pre-knowledge or if sustainability is a new thing, the risk is that those who don’t feel attracted to the topics discussed and don’t really understand – are those citizens who are either scared away or not committed or attracted at all.

6. Discussion

This part of the thesis will focus on and discuss themes emerged from the analysis. Themes that will be covered are: social media as a tool to communicate sustainability, thereafter the influence of tone will be covered, with its role in both an online as well as offline context. Thereafter the focus will be shifted towards a trial to examine to role of the participant; in order to understand how and when a citizen is considered to be a participant of a project, and even more importantly how to communicate that to the participants.

Issues and possibilities the choice of target group with a pre-existing knowledge and interest for sustainability have on the results will thereafter be discussed. Thereafter focus will be put on the aim to create sustainability without impairing the quality of life of the participants and if that is a possibility.

Then different roles the city of Gothenburg balances; as project manager of GreenhackGBG communicating in social media as well as a societal actor with public authority is the last theme of the discussion.

6.1 Brief summary

The results show clearly how difficult it is to communicate in social media, but also to understand how that communication is received by the target group. Since GreenhackGBG is a pioneering project in Gothenburg, that implements new strategies of communication with the citizens of Gothenburg. Activities within the project are implemented with the aim to increase the understanding of how to use social media for a city managed project. Even though the results reflect the specific qualities of GreenhackGBG, themes and issues uncovered could be brought up to a broader scale and to a certain extent be applied and give explanation to societal trends in a larger context. Hopefully the findings from this study can give valuable knowledge useful for both GreenhackGBG and other projects in the future, as well as contribute to the research field of social media and bring understanding from new perspectives, to the role social media have in the current society.

6.1.1 Limitations

Regarding time and other limiting factors, not all themes that have been discovered in the interviews and research have been possible to include in neither results nor discussion. Although some themes that have come visible in the process, which have not been possible to include are presented in a section for possible future research. In addition tangible ideas and applicable solutions expressed by participants as well as emerged from the data processing and analysis have been compiled into a list of proposals and solutions, presented as guidelines for GreenhackGBG.

6.2 Communicate sustainability in social media
As the results show, a majority of the interviewed citizens means that even though the content produced and shared in the social media platforms is information they often already know or are familiar with, GreenhackGBG is seen as a positive contribution to the city and their lifestyles. The communication is seen as a positive reminder of what to do in the everyday life, and although the information or GreenhackGBG as such don’t contribute or impact ways of their lives, GreenhackGBG with its communication still supports citizens. Those who already do things promoted by the project, or possibly even more, means that GreenhackGBG contributes and reinforces the willingness to do those activities. As one citizen said, the fact that GreenhackGBG exists in social media makes it into a constant reminder in the everyday life, since it is able to approach citizens in their private sphere. Therefore, GreenhackGBG does not only communicate about change, it also strengthens the act amongst those who already chosen more sustainable choices in life.

6.2.1 Sustainability as marketing and social media as the channel

Social media is also considered to be an efficient tool for marketing, where sustainability serves as a branding quality. In the context of GreenhackGBG, social media have been a great tool for communication, even though it demands adapted strategies, which are not completely in place yet. GreenhackGBG is a project undergoing constant development and therefore a project like GreenhackGBG needs to adapt their activities according to the structures social media creates. Since GreenhackGBG is a project that uses social media, and social media is a natural part of people’s everyday life today, GreenhackGBG is able to place itself as a project in pace with the current society and communication.

Sustainable development has also become a strong sales pitch today where brands, companies as well as cities brands themselves through an approach of sustainable development and sustainability. As the city of Gothenburg explains, the aim is to move beyond communicating with citizens, also to reach out towards other cities and inspire them to do something as well. The willingness to be seen as a pioneering project could thereby be a strategy in order to improve the largescale reputation of Gothenburg. GreenhackGBG could be considered as a project if developed even more, could improve the overall reputation of Gothenburg, simultaneously efforts like GreenhackGBG could beyond external reputation, also have an impact and improve citizens’ feelings and thoughts of the city and improve the internal reputation as well.

6.2.2 Measurability?

One important question that still stays without an answer is how the communication could be better or more efficient. In order to answer a question like that, and be able to evaluate the communication, tools or methods to measure communication in social media needs to be developed, as well adapted depending on what we really want to understand and evaluate.

Today, it is known that social media enables broadcasting of information easier than ever before and it also creates new spheres of communication. What still stays as a challenge for GreenhackGBG is how to measure the effects social media communication have in the offline everyday life. This is something GreenhackGBG currently lacks, as there are no specific tools or methods available in order to measure the participation and to see if the communication is efficient at all. The project aims to create participation in the online environment through the social media platforms in order to influence the participants so they make changes in their
everyday lives. The results have through the qualitative interviews been able to show what the specific individuals do, and don’t do. The issue is that those results are not generalizable or able to explain how the communication strategies functions on large scale.

What is seen is that the citizens to a large extent don’t adopt the promoted challenges, this was shown in the quantitative evaluation (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016) and is a result the qualitative interviews also shows. The general explanations is that the challenges are not challenging enough, there is a lack of feedback and not clearly enough stated why the citizens should participate in the challenges. Many citizens suggest a clearer feedback mechanism as something that would create positive pressure to make changes or at least, when accepting a challenge to do it. Citizen’s means if they would know that they receive feedback from project management or other citizens when adopting a challenge, it is more likely that they would carry it out. As a couple of citizens says; it is difficult to know what the project management want the citizens to do since there are a lot of different challenges and information spread, and since there is no connection or follow up mechanism, citizens feel that the willingness to do anything decreases. In order to do some of the challenges or change behaviour in their everyday life feedback is considered to be a highly efficient method; since the knowledge of feedback would be an incentive to do more. Otherwise the active choice to adopt a challenge is dependent to the individual’s personal views, and what value he/she puts into the idea of changing lifestyle.

One method to encourage participation according to the project management is to push the competitive part of humans. Which is an aspect recognized as a tool to increase the willingness to be involved also by one citizen. This person means competitions, where people for example could create teams where they together compete against other teams could increase the involvement and implementation of challenges and changes. On the other hand, another citizen sees the lack of competition as a positive quality of GreenhackGBG, since it creates a more sensitive and welcoming feeling to the project, especially amongst those who initially don’t do that much. In that case GreenhackGBG is positively recognized because it does not focus on those who make something best or the most, but instead that everyone can do something. These two angles are important to reconsider; even though competitive aspects of a project, especially when there is a prize included, creates a buzz and increases engagement and incentive to make an effort. However, it is important to regard whether competition is the right approach to reach citizens and make them engaged to such an extent that they want to continue and implement changes so they become long lasting and normalized in the everyday life, even after a competition is ended.

6.3 Tone

The aspect of whether or not to include competitions in a project, could be seen as part of the tone in the communication. How is the project communicated and what is included or not? As the results show there lays a great importance in the tone of the communication and the content produced and shared, in order to attract followers and create active participants.

As the citizens acknowledged and the city discusses, the different social media platforms have had different approaches and tone, which have given visible effects. Instagram is acknowledged by both citizens and city as the most popular social media feed since they used a clearly approach in the communication, with a lot of personality and individuality included which have separated GreenhackGBG on Instagram from the other platforms. The choice to
use a more personal approach in the communication have been appreciated amongst the citizens as well as the bloggers, since it creates an easy-going and attractive tone in the communication, it’s a person who speaks directly to the citizen, not the project or the authority city of Gothenburg. This also shows that it’s not always what is said that is the import, but rather how you say it that has the largest impact. The structural properties of Instagram have also had an impact on the positive results, since Instagram-users are able to customize and adapt the information feed to own interests, and in the case of the first trial year of GreenhackGBG this correspond well with the target group who have an initial interest of sustainability and to a large extent follows other Instagram accounts with similar content. Contrary the structural aspect of Instagram has an impact on GreenhackGBG possibility to reach out and attract new participants on Instagram. As one blogger explained, it is difficult to attract those who do not have any interest of the message you try to promote, since social media is a social sphere which individuals use to reinforce own ideas and thoughts and thereby often only sees those things. In other words, the choice to follow or not follow GreenhackGBG is rooted in the individuals pre-existing interests and willingness to actively search for GreenhackGBG.

The aspect of personality in communication makes it easier to apply information on oneself. As citizens described, the personal approach is easier to connect to, for instance when seeing that someone else actually does a challenge or shares experiences rather than just be told by an impersonal voice. The information flow becomes more of a bottom up-approach when personality is included which thereby to a larger extent enables discussions and opportunities for distribution of knowledge amongst citizens. In a bottom-up context the information and content communicated is adapted and developed in cooperation between project management and participants, in other words citizens are able to give input, ask or answer questions and comment, which creates practices of participation. Contrary Facebook, which initially was thought to be the easiest social media to use for GreenhackGBG, have had a different communication strategy. It has not adapted the personal approach as Instagram, GreenhackGBG has rather used Facebook as a platform for information sharing and formal communication, where the project is the sender. It is the social media platform where GreenhackGBG have the most formal approach; a strategy citizens have experienced as a top down approach where the project communicates and shares information to the citizens. As one citizen said the communication sometimes feels like the project communicates down towards the citizens, telling them what to do rather than communicating on the same level. The results are tangible, the communication taken place at Facebook have not created the same amount of participation or feedback from the citizens through likes, comments, shares and discussions. Although whether it is the communication per se, or the platform structure that has had the largest impact is hard to proof.

6.3.1 GreenhackGBG online and offline

Even though the social media platforms have been the main tools for communication of GreenhackGBG, it has become clear that the real life meetings have made impression amongst those who have partaken those. Citizens who have not managed to partake have also seen the meetings as a positive aspect of the project, and the majority of the citizens would like to participate at these meetings.
The events taking place offline, through events such as “Sluta snacka, börja Greenhacka” and the breakfast seminars have been experienced as positive by the citizens. It’s evident that those who take part of the seminars, and met people in reality in connection to the project, considers themselves to a larger extent as participants, than those who have not partaken the meetings. As one of the citizens who had not visited the breakfast seminars said; it would probably feel more like being part of GreenhackGBG if it had been possible to partake those meetings, therefore this citizen wishes seminars could be held at other hours.

Even though social media is a good platform in order to broadcast information and reach out to a broad audience and involve people, the real life meetings creates a stronger feeling of participation than the attempts to create participation in the online setting. The case of GreenhackGBG shows that even though a project that uses social media, which should be considered as a social space that creates inclusion and new cultures of participation, it’s still real life/offline meetings that creates a stronger feeling of participation amongst citizens.

Also as discussed earlier, keeping a personal tone has a major impact, which is proven by Instagram as well as the real meetings. Therefore, by having more specific forums for discussions, but also to a larger extent encourage citizens to ask questions or discuss things would increase the probability that more participation would take place. To increase the personal tone in the communication and content shared could have positive impact on the participation and the amount of citizens who would get involved, and even more importantly make individuals feel like participants.

### 6.4 When are you a participant?

The question of when you are an active participant appeared and was discussed frequently in the interviews. Many of the citizens who were interviewed for this thesis asked already before the interview took place whether they were suitable as participants in the interview or not. Since I had searched for participants who were willing to contribute with their experiences and thoughts about the project, it was surprising that someone who voluntarily partaken still did not know whether he/she was suitable for the interview. But this was not just one case, several of the citizens did not know if they consider themselves as participants of the project. This was surprising at first, but when more citizens asked or claimed the same thing it came clear; social media makes it difficult for the citizens to know if they are considered to be participants (both by themselves, but also in the eyes of the project management). And even more importantly, many of the citizens wondered what is demanded by them to do, in order to be considered as participants. This is an aspect which impacts whether citizens actively takes part of challenges and participates in the project, being included in a process is essential in order to adapt and implement changes on an individual scale. This confirms the results of the quantitative evaluation (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016); the majority of the citizens interviewed have not partaken any of the challenges, neither they have asked that much questions in the social media feeds, nor partaken in discussions.

So, what is then participation in a project or campaign that takes place in social media? Both positive and negative aspects of social media use are visible. Positive is how easy it is to take part of information, with or without any restrictions. It is easy to “like” or “comment” posts and information in the social media feed, but it is even easier to just read or scroll, and thus not do anything actively. The active choice to listen to the information and adopt challenges and changes promoted online to the offline everyday life is an even longer step.
GreenhackGBG promotes changes on an individual level and social media is an inevitably efficient way to broadcast information on an easy-going everyday level. Social media, especially Facebook is built upon the idea and structure of likes, comments and sharing of information as main tool to spread content. The idea of followers that share posts is a highly efficient way to create a buzz, and this has been an issue GreenhackGBG have struggled with. GreenhackGBG have not experienced willingness amongst followers to get involved and share posts by the project, discussions rarely take place in the posts and the amount of likes and comments is relatively low, compared to the activity that takes place on Instagram. One citizen means that the information at Facebook is not attractive enough, to make it interesting to share, since the tone of communication sometimes is too municipal. Other aspects on Facebook is that the information shared is heavier to read than the really easy-accessible information at Instagram. On the other hand, citizens’ requests even more (and more thorough) information in order to contextualize GreenhackGBG even more, these are qualities that conquers each other. In the context of the homepage and the blog there is not even a possibility to comment as a reader/follower. Thereby the possibility to create active participants, based on the idea to include and enable anyone to contribute or ask questions is completely lost.

6.5 To use the experiences for future development

This thesis looks at the initial year of the GreenhackGBG project. In connection to this one thing that has become clear during the interviews is that GreenhackGBG is a highly appreciated project and contribution to the city of Gothenburg. Though, a frequently asked question is why GreenhackGBG is addressed towards the chosen target group, citizens with a pre-existing interest for sustainability. Citizens question whether there is validity to address the trial year towards a target group with an initial interest, knowledge and awareness considering the topic of the project And even more importantly, is it feasible to make a project towards more sustainable lifestyles within a city, if the first trial year is directed towards those who already consider themselves to make sustainable choices in life? Since many of the interviewed citizens consider themselves to already do more than the project encourages them to do, it is also important to connect back to this thesis and the results; since it could be questionable how efficient or useful the knowledge from the first year of trial will be for the development of the future of GreenhackGBG, when the aim is to promote the project towards larger parts of Gothenburg.

Some of the interviewed citizens wonder why efforts are put on those who already have a general knowledge. Many of the citizens’ experience that the group involved in GreenhackGBG are homogenous with similar views on the issues promoted in the project. Initially, a group with an inherent interest for sustainability and environment is a good group to start with when introducing a new sustainability project. To start with an already interested citizen is a rewarding approach, since it takes less effort to get those involved. The city explains this choice as a strategic one, where the specific target group is considered to give advantages such as getting the project started through a lower need of resources and also increase the possibility that the messages are spread to others. Though, GreenhackGBG is a tax-funded project and therefore it is crucial for the project management to show positive results in order to grant a future for the project. Therefore since GreenhackGBG is able to show positive results such as the amount of participants, there is an increased possibility to get more support and secure future funding for the project.
For the future a broader scope especially considering the target-group will be needed, and GreenhackGBG aims to include more people and groups in the future. The choice to promote GreenhackGBG to the group with a pre-existing interest is a good way to spark the idea and embed GreenhackGBG into the city and the minds of the citizens, in order to thereafter broaden the scope and promote it to more citizens. Complementary, when the tool “Svalna” is introduced, that could have a larger impact and activate larger target groups, since the tool will enable easier ways to physically see what effect everyday activities have on the individual CO2 emissions. The tool aims to show what tangible effects changes in behaviour have and this is also an aspect that probably is able to make an impact on those who don’t have the pre-existing interest or knowledge, since it gives tangible results, which have deeper impact on people than just words are able to have.

The tool “Svalna” is further a tool that fits in to the wishes of interviewed citizens; since they ask for tools, methods and clear contextualization, which “Svalna” efficiently and easily would do. Even though GreenhackGBG approaches citizens on an everyday level, a tool like “Svalna” will probably enable an even more efficient communication, since it gives explanations and tangible results applicable on everyday life practices and activities. When this tool is initiated GreenhackGBG will possibly reach broader audiences and incorporate larger parts of Gothenburg Citizens.

6.6 Sustainability without an impact on the quality of life?

As the quantitative evaluation (“Utvärdering GreenhackGBG 2015”, 2016) explains, GreenhackGBG aims to show the citizens of Gothenburg that it is possible to create a more sustainable city as well as more sustainable lifestyles without an impair in the quality of life. As a method to approach citizens who do not have an initial interest of sustainability questions or issues, this approach could be beneficial since it makes the act of changing less frightening and distanced from the current life style, values and attitudes.

On the other hand, the problem and issue with this approach is what kind of changes the project really creates. GreenhackGBG openly says that it is up to each and every individual to take on the information and challenges however they want, and they can do it as much or little as they are able to or want to. This could thereby mean that GreenhackGBG are satisfied if people just reads the information, but do not do any real changes in their lifestyle or behaviour. This is something that could be seen as problematic since the project claims contrasting information. GreenhackGBG says they want to create change, but it is left to the citizens’ conditions. After the initial trial year this aspect have probably not been much of an issue, since those who have been approached have foremost been those with a pre-existing interest of sustainability. Thereby the participants this far have had an existing awareness that probably colours what they do within the frames of the project, as well as how they perceive the information and challenges posted. As the results shows, a majority of the citizens who have been interviewed already do or does even more than GreenhackGBG requests, in other words, the target group accords to the approach GreenhackGBG have. Since participants does more than what the project requests they live their lives in a way that could be defined as appropriate and in harmony with the GreenhackGBG vision.

I claim that this soft approach, where the easiest path is chosen with interested citizens who has a pre-existing awareness could be an issue for the future of the project. Since the first trial year aims to give knowledge, experiences and feedback to develop GreenhackGBG and make
it even more efficient, the chosen approach runs the risk to give false ideas of what works and what doesn’t. Since the majority of those who have been part of GreenhackGBG this far have a pre-existing awareness and many citizens declared that they want more and deeper information and more difficult challenges it is questionable how these requests should be applied in the future of GreenhackGBG. Even though that it is a positive outcome since it shows that GreenhackGBG creates engagement and those participating are encouraged to such an extent that want more knowledge and be engaged even more. On the other hand, GreenhackGBG aims to broaden their target group and reach and engage even more people in Gothenburg, the experiences and feedback provided based on the trial year could make the project more isolated. Therefore there lays a great importance to balance the feedback with the knowledge about the pre-conditions of those who participates in the project today.

6.7 To communicate – GreenhackGBG vs. Public authority

Since GreenhackGBG is a project managed by the city of Gothenburg, it is important to discuss whether there are restrictions of how the project could and should be communicated. It is important to question whether, and if yes, how the city “role as a public authority” influence the GreenhackGBG communication. The role of the city within GreenhackGBG is important to highlight and problematize. What kind of impact does GreenhackGBG have on the city of Gothenburg, and of course equally important it is to ask what kind of impact the city of Gothenburg have back to GreenhackGBG. How the communication is practiced have an impact on how the city is perceived, in similar manners as GreenhackGBG probably is influenced by the city. The credibility of the project and the credibility of city are equally connected to each other. As the results shows, there are different opinions and experiences around GreenhackGBG. Some citizens have clearly experienced GreenhackGBG as a project managed by the city of Gothenburg while other citizens means that it has been difficult to see that GreenhackGBG is a city managed project. In what way the participants perceive a project management as the sender of information, has an influence on how transmitted information or messages are perceived by the receiver. As one of the citizens said it felt weird when the city of Gothenburg posted information on Instagram in the middle of the night. That is an example of when the project is perceived as closely connected to the city and thereby also the communication and activities are compared to “how the city should” act. On the other hand, another citizen said that GreenhackGBG is too municipal in its communication. Since social media is a place that never sleeps, the information-flow is constant, GreenhackGBG was experienced as too municipal at Facebook, when it only communicates during office hours, and not in the same pace as social media constantly flows.

7. Future research

As the results and discussion has shown, it has become clear that GreenhackGBG is a multifaceted project. It has become clear that the aim to understand how the communication taken place in social media affects citizens and whether the projects creates participation and content that is translated into the everyday life of the citizens is not an easy question to answer. GreenhackGBG have during 2015 been able to create involvement and content in the communication that attracts the chosen target group, the project is an appreciated project, but both project management as well as participants acknowledges issues and possibilities connected to the chosen approach. Though, the big question that still remains is how to involve those who are not involved yet. In order to involve even more participants I have
chosen to both present issues that evolved in the thesis that could serve as a base for future research in order to explore even more aspects of GreenhackGBG.

The data collected for this thesis has shown that there are many unexplored aspects of GreenhackGBG that could be studied. These other angles would both increase the understanding of the project as such, but could also be a tool in order to understand what effects a project that takes place in social media have on existing ideas of communication. Social media studies could also benefit since further studies also increases the understanding of the current society where social media is a natural part of everyday life and activities.

A lot of other themes have been uncovered as possible and important aspect to further study, though, these are beyond the scope of this thesis work, and are therefore presented as possible future research that could be conducted around GreenhackGBG, see 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3.

7.1 Identity formation

Sustainable lifestyle is often connected to something positive for the formation of identity amongst individuals. Who a person is or wants others to see, is something an individual is able to push through the use of social media in order to place oneself within a specific context. Today, sustainability has become increasingly important as a way to brand and contextualize oneself. Although, a person who is considered as sustainable and environmentally aware still risks to meet prejudice. Sustainability and environmental friendliness has through time been connected to stereotypical ideas of how persons should be. And to a certain extent these opinions and ideas still exists. One of the citizens means that it is easier to use Instagram as a source and media to follow sustainability and environmental groups; since it is more private. When an individual likes things on Facebook it is broadcasted amongst friends, and thereby promoted what he or she likes, and thereby this individual believes that it increase stereotypical ideas of who that person is. Therefore there would be space for future studies concerning the impact of social media in the formation of identity, and what impact sustainability could have on those self-identification and formation processes.

7.2 GreenhackGBG as branding

An approach briefly discussed is the potential sustainability and social media has for branding. GreenhackGBG and the city of Gothenburg could possibly benefit from further analyse how a sustainability project like GreenhackGBG contributes to the branding of Gothenburg. Since GreenhackGBG is a project that uses social media, and social media is an efficient platform for marketing, it would be important to analyse what impacts the project have on the city as such. The question of what impact GreenhackGBG have on the reputation of the city of Gothenburg would be interesting to further investigate. And a study like that could further be combined with a focus on economic aspects, to conclude what economic benefits a project like GreenhackGBG could have on a city.

7.3 Target group issues

Gender, pre-existing interests and background have shown to be a large issue concerning the participants of today. GreenhackGBG has this far shown, both through the quantitative evaluation made as well as this qualitative study that it mainly attracts a very homogenous group of people and it has also been an active choice by the project management. This is an
aspect that could be interesting to study further, in order to understand how a broader target
group could be reached.

8. Future of GreenhackGBG

In addition to all the results presented and discussed in this thesis, practical ideas and
solutions have been brought up by citizens and bloggers during the interviews as well as
evolved in the analysis. These solutions are considered to be too valuable to not mention in
this thesis, so they are presented in the following bullet points.

The wish is that these ideas and solutions will serve as further explanation to what changes
could be implemented to GreenhackGBG in order to make it even better and more efficient.
The suggestions also confirms the importance citizens of Gothenburg put into
GreenhackGBG, since all interviewed bloggers and citizens have provided many tangible
ideas of what to change or implement into GreenhackGBG. Interviewed persons have shown
a great amount of willingness to contribute in the development of the project, and these are
the ideas and solutions provided. Hopefully at least some of these points will serve as useful
ideas and possible solutions to implement in the GreenhackGBG project for future
development.

8.1 Suggestions and ideas for GreenhackGBG:

- Create forums for discussion – enables citizens to together reach deeper
  understanding but also share knowledge and experiences
- Create GreenhackGBG-Groups on Facebook – where citizens can/would be
  encouraged to discuss current topics together
- More Context – grounding the project into a broader context of sustainable
  development, which would explain why the individual should bother to get
  involved.
- Ask questions to the followers in the social media posts, which would increase
  and encourage interaction between participants and management
- Increase the focus on participants; what does the citizens in Gothenburg do? In
  connection to the weekly challenges or topics that are discussed and promoted
- Request people to use the hashtag; #GreenhackGBG, when posting
  updates/pictures in connection to the challenges, which also would
  contribute to an increased interaction and function as a feedback mechanism.
- “The picture of the week”. Use the #GreenhackGBG in connection to the
  theme, and encourage citizens to upload pictures connected to the theme,
  which both would increase the interaction, the use of the #, as well as it
  increases the connection/feedback between project management and
  participants.
- Seminars, should be held at other hours, to open up for people who do not have
  the possibility to attend in the mornings. Not only focus on breakfast meetings
  but possibly have evening seminars.
- Live-stream the seminars on the homepage, either web-TV or like a pod-cast.
  Then create a library of the seminars where those who could not attend or
  watch/listen to it live, could take part of it later on.
• Increase the amount of reading in connection to the issues and monthly themes. More and deeper articles would put the project into a larger context. But it would also explain what impact the individual challenges have on a larger scale.
• Create a catalogue of the content (A-Ö), would make it easier to find information on the homepage, but it could also be a way to connect the content in the different social media.
• Include a glossary on the homepage
• Connect GreenhackGBG to Gothenburg even more. Talk more about happenings in the city, spread information about events connected to sustainability, but also show what the city does in connection to the monthly themes and activities that are promoted.
• Utilize positive aspects patriotism towards Gothenburg could create. To promote GreenhackGBG as a project connected to the city could increase the internal energy, so GreenhackGBG becomes something the citizens of Gothenburg are proud of and thereby spreads the word about and get involved in.
• Make GreenhackGBG into a network – connect the project to external societal actors, such as larger companies and organisations.
• Make GreenhackGBG into a facilitator and an area of networking that connects individuals and organizations that are active within the environmental and sustainability movement in Gothenburg.
• Revisit people who have been part of GreenhackGBG, who have adopted a challenge, to see where they are now. This could also be applied on the families who were part of the “Leva Livet”-project. “How has it been since…” What are these families doing now? How did their lives change/develop after the project? Possibly these could also contribute with experiences that could be used to adapt GreenhackGBG project, communication and the challenges.
• Have competitions – increase the involvement. E.g. Who have the most creative way to translate the theme of the month into an activity in the offline environment?
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11. Appendix

11.1 Appendix I

Intervjuguide för intervju med Göteborgs stad.

1. Greenhack

- Berätta allmänt om vad Miljöförvaltningen jobbar med, och vilken roll du/ni har där
- Hur har ni varit involverade i just Greenhack? Vad har ni gjort/eller gör inom projektet?
- Greenhack Göteborg – Hur skulle ni beskriva kampanjen/projektet med egna ord?
- Berätta hur Greenhack uppstod: varför ville man genomföra projektet, och vad är målet med projektet?
- Driver Göteborgs stad andra liknande projekt som Greenhack ingår i/kompletterar?

Frågor att flika in under diskussionerna:

- Vad menar ni med ”hållbarhet” i denna kampanj?

- Kampanjen är tydligt riktad till att ”få med” befolkningen och öka intresse och engagemang för hållbarhetsfrågor
  - varför har ni valt att rikta in er på en målgrupp som enligt utvärderingsrapporten ”redan sitter i båten” (både gällande sociala medier + hållbarhet).
  - Ger första-fasen tillförlitliga resultat om hur effektiv kampanjen är i sådant fall. Är resultaten applikerbara på resten av Göteborg?
  - Vad finns det för fördelar och nackdelar i att inleda projektet med den valda målgruppen?

2. Innehållet i medieplattformarna och utformningen av kampanjen

- Hur såg processen att välja kanaler/medieplattformar ut – varför ser Greenhack ut som det gör idag?
  - Varför valde ni de här digitala Plattformarna (webbsida, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram)?
- Varför valde ni att rikta in kampanjens första skede på målgruppen 26-46 åringar?
  - Påverkade målgruppen hur ni utformade Greenhack? Hur då?
- Utformning av innehållet och meddelanden – hur har det gått till?
  - Vad vill ni att innehållet ska göra?
  - Hur tänkte ni kring nivå på innehållet?
  - Olika innehåll i olika kanaler?
  - Vilken nivå av engagemang har ni eftersträvat?
  - Finns det olika nivåer av engagemang? Att ”likea”, att anta en utmaning, att svara/skriva i de olika kanalerna?
- Hur kom det sig att ni valde månatliga teman?
  - Hur bestämde ni er för dem?
• Finns det ämnen, frågor, etc som ni hade velat ta upp men känt att ni inte kunnat? Vilka, varför?
• Hur kom det sig att ni valde att ha gästbloggare, och vilka är de?
  – Vad fick de i uppdrag att göra?
  – Hur tänkte ni kring er egen roll i Greenhack?
  – Vem är avsändaren (stadens, Miljöförvaltningen, någon annan)?
• I ett drömscenario: hur hade ni velat att målgruppen skulle använda sig av Greenhack? Vad skulle en ”idealanvändare” göra?

3. Hur har målgruppen interagerat med innehållet?/Användningen av Greenhack (jag tänker att användningen/interaktionen också handlar om moderatoren, gästbloggare, andra deltagare)

• Hur har jobbet sett ut för er att driva Greenhack?
  – Vilka av er har deltagit aktivt på de sociala medierna? Vad har ni gjort då?
  – Vad har varit utmanande respektive givande med att driva Greenhack?
  – Vad har ni behövt tänka på som avsändare i Greenhack?
• Hur har målgruppen interagerat på GreenhackGBG:s olika digitala plattformar (med innehållet, staden, gästbloggare, andra deltagare)?
  – Hur har kommunikationen sett ut mellan er och deltagare? Ge exempel.
  – Mellan gästbloggare och deltagare? Ge exempel.
  – Finns det olika roller i Greenhack? Hur skulle ni beskriva dem (t ex moderatör, deltagare)?
• Hur har det material som skapats (genom inlägg/diskussioner/publicerat material från invånarna/deltagarna) använts av er som projektledare? / Hur har ni jobbat kontinuerligt med det material som deltagarna bidragit med genom inlägg etc.? (t ex försökt få till diskussion?)
  – Har ni haft någon strategi för detta?
  – Har deltagarnas inlägg styrt eller påverkat något?
  – Vad har varit utmanande respektive givande med en sådan dynamisk process?
• Hur har kampanjen sett ut ”i verkligheten”, t.ex. hur har seminarierna varit utformade?
• Har deltagandet där skilt sig från det som skett i de sociala medierna?
• Såg ni någon förändring i målgruppens interaktion under året (2015)?
• Hur har er kommunikation/utformandet av kampanjen förändrats under året (2015)?

4. Egna reflektioner om hur det har gått

• Givet era mål, hur tycker ni själva att det har gått?
  – Vad har varit mest överraskande under den här resans gång?
  – Någon besvikelse?
• Har kampanjen fått den önskade uppmärksamheten i Göteborg?
• Vad har kampanjen gett för faktiska resulterat/effekter, be om faktiska exempel – utveckla gärna!
• Vilken del av Greenhack har varit mest framgångsrikt, och vilken del minst? Varför?
• Hur har plattformarna/kanalerna fungerat? Vilka har fungerat bättre/sämre än förväntat?
• Ge exempel på lyckade månadsteman, och exempel på mindre lyckade månadstema: vad tror ni har gjorde dem lyckade vs. Mindre lyckade?
• Hur har ni ”mätt” engagemang, för att kunna säga om kampanjen ’lyckats’?
  – Hur har ni sett på olika sätt att engagera sig t ex ”likea” eller anta en utmaning? Betyder de olika saker, vad då?
• Kampanjen är tydligt riktad till att ”få med” befolkningen och öka intresse och engagemang för hållbarhetsfrågor. Hur ser ni på resultatet från 2015 med tanke på att målgruppen i första skedet kan sägas ”redan sitta i båten”? Hur tänker ni gå vidare för att få med andra grupper i Göteborg?
  – Skulle en satsning på andra/ytterligare målgrupper påverka upplägget på kampanjen? Hur då?

5. Framtid?

• Hur går ni vidare med den kunskap och de erfarenheter ni samlat in i de sociala medierna/internet-plattformarna till verkligheten?
• Har ni tänkt göra några ändringar vad gäller utformning och upplägg, målgrupp, strategi, utifrån det ni lärt er under projektets gång? Hur/Varför?
  – Om ni skulle ge tips till andra städer som vill satsa på liknande projekt – vad ska de tänka på då?
• Hur skulle ni kunna få fler att engagera sig?
• Hur skulle ni vilja att GreenhackGBG utvecklades?
  – Vad tror ni att den här typen av satsningar betyder i en större satsning på hållbar utveckling?
• Var befinner sig GreenhackGBG år 2030?
11.2 Appendix II

Intervjuguide för intervju med Projektdeltagare

- Kan du berätta lite om dig själv, vem är du?
- Hur skulle du beskriva GreenhackGBG? (Förstå hur individen definierar/förstår projektet)

Frågor att möjligtvis flika in under första frågan (eller ev. under frågan hur de blev intresserade av Greenhack):

- Hur definierar du begreppet Hållbarhet?
- Hur kom du i kontakt med Greenhack?
- Vad var det som gjorde att du blev intresserad av Greenhack? (det kan ev. vara svårt för dem att komma ihåg detta eftersom kampanjen har pågått ett tag)
- Greenhack består ju av flera delar, t ex en hemsida, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, samt seminarier. Jag kommer återkomma till detta mer i detalj lite senare, men jag är nyfiken på vilka delar har du varit i kontakt med, eller deltagit i? Är det någon del du använt mest/deltagit mest i? Om ja, varför?
- Har du deltagit i någon utmaning?
- Hur har du deltagit i kampanjen/projektet?

Om begreppen kommer upp, be om definitioner!

- Vad innebär deltagande för dig?
- Vad innebär dialog

- Varför valde du att delta/engagera dig?

Sociala medier

- Innan jag frågar mer om Greenhack, så skulle jag vilja veta lite om hur du använder sociala medier allmänt i din vardag: Kan du berätta om igår, från att du vaknade på morgonen till att du gick och la dig på kvällen, hur du använde sociala medier? Vad gjorde du, vilka tjänster (alltså t ex Facebook, Twitter) använte du, och varför?
- Var detta en typisk dag vad gäller användning av sociala medier? Om inte, varför, och vad är en typisk dag?
- Bortsett från det du just berättade om, använder du andra sociala medietjänster? Vilka? Vad brukar du göra på dem?
- (om inte nämnt) Vad använder du för pryl när du använder sociala medier? Mobil, surfplatta, dator, något annat? Varför just dessa?
- Vad är det du värdesätter mest med sociala medier i allmänhet? Och vad tycker du är mest problematiskt?
- Nu skulle jag gärna vilja veta lite mer specifikt om hur du har varit i kontakt med Greenhack. Du nämnde att du har använt X, Y, Z… (här beror det ju på vad de har gjort, så frågorna får ställas beroende på plattform/tjänst, och upprepas för varje plattform de har använt!)
- Vilka har du använt mest/minst, varför?
- Ska vi börja med X som du använt mest: Vad tycker du att X [t ex Greenhack’s Facebook] har handlat om? (ficka efter dels innehåll, men även vilken roll det kan spela, t ex ”forum för diskussion”, ”kontakt med likasinnade”)
  - Kan du ge exempel på vad du har gjort på [t ex Greenhack’s Facebook]? (kanske har de ”bara” passivt följt, men det vill vi ju i så fall också veta!)
  - Har du gjort inlägg, t ex kommenterat?
  - Om ja, vad har de handlar om?
  - Om inte, varför då? Hur skulle det vara för att få dig att göra inlägg?
  - Fick du någon feedback på dina inlägg?
  - Om ja, vad då? Vem gav feedback (t ex moderator, deltagare)?
  - Om inte, vad hade du velat ha för feedback? Vad hade varit värdefullt att få?
  - (Om mera passivt följt, fråga om detta) Varför?
  - (Fortsätt med nästa plattform, om använt flera)

Erfarenheter/reflektion på Greenhack

  - Vad tycker du har varit mest givande med Greenhack i stort? (t ex inspiration, konkreta tips, kontakt med likasinnade?)
  - Vad har du tagit med dig från Greenhack så här långt? Har det bidragit till att du har kunnat förändra något i ditt liv, eller hur du ser på hållbarhetsutmaningar?
  - Har de sociala medierna som används i kampanjen varit de rätta?
  - Hur har de sociala medierna fungerat som plattformar för diskussioner?
  - Har du deltagit vid ex. frukost seminarerna (eller andra engagemang som varit utanför internet/mmedierna)? Hur har du deltagit?
  - Skulle du göra något annorlunda kopplat till kampanjen nu i efterhand? Hur/Vad/Varför?
  - Hur borde kampanjen vara utformad för att du skulle engagera dig ännu mer?
  - Finns det frågor eller innehåll eller något annat som du gärna hade velat se i Greenhack men som hittills har saknats?

Hållbarhet – jag vet inte var det skulle vara vettigt att ha de här frågorna… Egentligen innan sociala medier, men den sista frågan om Greenhack’s roll borde komma efter som någon slags övergripande reflektion

  - (Om de pratar om miljö/hållbarhet som intresse/motivation) Hur skulle du säga att du försöker leva mer hållbart i din vardag?
  - Kan du ge exempel på något du gör?
  - Finns det något du är stolt över att du gör?
  - Vilket är det största hindret från att göra mer?
  - Hur tycker du att en satsning som Greenhack passar in i att försöka leva mer hållbart?

Framtid?

  - Vad har du för tips till Göteborgs stad för framtiden?
  - Hur skulle du vilja tycker du att GreenhackGBG borde utvecklas?
11.3 Appendix III

Consent form

Samtycke för deltagande i intervju

Jag skulle vilja intervjua dig till en forskningsstudie. Formuläret nedan beskriver kort studien och vad det innebär att ta del i studien. Tveka inte att fråga mig om något är oklart.

Kontaktperson: Hanna Kronström, student, Mastersprogram i Hållbar Utveckling, Uppsala Universitet.

Kontaktuppgifter: Mail: hannakronstrom@hotmail.com Tel: 070-7507351

Så här säger svensk lag

Vid forskning finns det krav i såväl internationella riktlinjer som i svensk lag (etikprövningslagen 13-22 §§) att deltagare samtycker till att medverka i studien. Forskningsdeltagaren har rätt att när som helst och med omedelbar verkan återta sitt samtycke, något skäl behöver han eller hon inte ange. Data som redan insamlats får dock användas i forskningen.

Vad studien handlar om


Vad det innebär att deltaga i intervjun


Deltagandet i intervjun är helt frivilligt och du kan avbryta intervjun när som helst utan att behöva förklara varför. Du behöver inte heller svara på frågor om du av någon anledning inte vill.

Jag kommer att ta anteckningar under intervjun, men för att göra det enklare för mig så vill jag gärna spela in intervjun för att senare kunna transkribera den. Om du av någon anledning inte vill bli inspelad så är detta naturligtvis ok. Det går att delta utan inspelning.

Behandling av insamlat material

All insamlad information och material kommer att behandlas konfidentiellt samt anonymiseras, så att inga påståenden, citat eller åsikter kan kopplas till person. Detta gäller
intervjuer samt eventuella publika inlägg på GreenhackGBG kanaler på nätet. Inspelningarna kommer att raderas när projektet är färdigställt.

Genom att skriva under detta dokument samtycker jag till att bli intervjuad.

☐ Genom att checka i rutan godkänner jag att bli inspelad under intervjun.

☐ Jag vill få en kopia av den färdiga uppsatsen:

Skickad till e-mail:

________________________________________

Underskrift

Datum

________________________________________

Namnförtydligande