MPC MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER

From Beatlemania to Bieber Fever: The Evolution of Celebrity/Fan Interactions

Haley Coppins

Dr. John Shiga

The Major Research Paper is submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Professional Communication

Ryerson University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

August 25th, 2016

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF A MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this Major Research Paper and the accompanying Research Poster. This is a true copy of the MRP and the research poster, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this major research paper and/or poster to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this MRP and/or poster by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I understand that my MRP and/or my MRP research poster may be made electronically available to the public.

ABSTRACT

Celebrities and fans have been researched by scholars throughout the years, with differing opinions regarding their characteristics and relationships. Prior to the development of the internet, fans were characterized by scholars as deranged, hysterical and passive. Their relationships with celebrities were seen as exclusively one-sided and parasocial. Conversely, since the development of the internet fans have been characterized more favourably as active participants. In this paper, I perform a textual analysis of Twitter conversations between bands/artists and fans in an attempt to better understand if and how celebrity-fan interactions have changed from early scholarly interpretations. I argue that Twitter is changing celebrity-fan interactions, not only by encouraging reciprocal interactions but also by enabling more personal, intimate conversations. Twitter is allowing bands and fans to interact in a number of different ways that simultaneously build relationships and serve commercial functions such as promotion. Fans have become more actively involved in content production and powerful in influencing the way bands promote themselves. Used properly, Twitter can be a valuable tool for bands and artists to market themselves.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Ryerson University for giving me the opportunity to further my education and provide me with the necessary resources to fulfill this program. I would also like to thank my supervisor, Dr. John Shiga for his incredible help during this process. Your guidance and insight throughout this process has been invaluable. Next, I would like to thank my second reader Dr. Matthew Tiessen for his input. Finally, I would like to thank my family, friends and loved ones for their constant support throughout this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Celebrities and fans are deeply interconnected entities. Without fans, there are no celebrities, and without celebrities there are no fans. This co-dependence is evident in a number of industries but it is particularly important in the music industry as bands and artists rely on fans for their overall success, including record sales, concert ticket sales and merchandise sales. Because the success of bands and artists is so dependent on fans, better understanding fandom within the music industry and how celebrities and fans interact becomes very important for a number of reasons. Economically, understanding modes of communication between celebrities and fans can help artists and bands market themselves and connect with fans. Socially, it is important to show fans as not simply obsessive and deranged, but rather contributing members to society who build and maintain a community around a shared set of values. Culturally, it is important to explore how fans create their own culture by negotiating the meaning of works produced by the music industry and creating their own content as well. In this MRP, I analyze conversations between celebrities and fans on Twitter, a widely-used tool in the music industry, particularly among smaller bands who do not have a big promotional budget and depend on social media to connect with their fans and further market themselves.

Included in this MRP is a literature review that will explore scholarly interpretations of celebrity-fan interactions beginning in roughly the 1950s when radio and television were popular. My review will extend to contemporary scholarly literature and will include a discussion of the development of the internet and social media. Tracing this historical progression is necessary because each of these major media advancements has offered fans new tools to engage with celebrities and in doing so has affected the nature of celebrity-fan interactions. Traditional scholarly interpretations viewed fans as passive consumers who contributed little to musical

culture and who became obsessed with celebrities. However, new forms of media have challenged traditional interpretations of celebrity-fan interactions and relationships by allowing fans to actively participate in the production of content. As a result, this MRP will explore how social media have changed celebrity-fan interactions by offering fans a method to contribute content and interact with celebrities in ways that earlier media did not allow.

In doing so, three overarching bodies of literature will be explored. Parasocial interaction theory will be examined to better understand how one-way communication via television and radio shaped relationships between celebrities and fans. After examining parasocial interaction theory, this MRP will explore the way social media enable more personal and reciprocal relationships between media users and figures to flourish in comparison to celebrity-fan relationship in the context of mass-media. Drawing on media and communication scholars such as Henry Jenkins, I will explore how the participatory nature of social media has allowed fans to contribute more content, and in doing so has changed the characteristics of celebrity-fan interactions and relationships. Finally, my survey of fandom and audience studies literature published before and after the emergence of the internet contrasts early scholarly interpretations of fans/audiences as passive, delusional, and obsessed with more recent concepts of fans as active contributors. Altogether, it is hoped that my review of these bodies of literature will improve understanding of the role of fans in music cultures and how scholarly interpretations of celebrity-fan interactions have changed with the emergence of new media forms.

Based on these bodies of literature, the following research questions were developed:

RQ1: According to the scholarly literature, what were the defining characteristics of celebrity-fan interactions in the context of mass media?

RQ2: According to more recent literature, how are social media helping to reshape celebrity-fan relationships and interactions today?

RQ3: To what extent are the characteristics that scholars associate with celebrity-fan interactions and relationships reflected in actual Twitter conversations between fans and celebrities?

By including literature published both before the development of the internet and after, the first two research questions will help in developing a better understanding of how celebrity-fan interactions and relationships have progressed as media forms have evolved. Answering the subsequent research question will allow for a more current and up-to-date analysis of celebrity-fan interactions on social media, and responds to gaps in the literature around the role of social media in celebrity-fan interactions/relationships.

This MRP, then, will contribute to our understanding of the nature of celebrity-fan interactions on Twitter within the music industry. Empirical studies of social media use among bands and artists are still quite rare, therefore I have decided to focus on the manner in which social media can help promote and market bands and artists while maintaining more personal contact with fans. While much of the work on participatory culture and fan cultures focuses on digital cinema, I will explore these cultural developments within the music industry and examine what the content created by fans can tell us about celebrity-fan interactions and about the music industry more broadly.

This research will contribute knowledge to fandom research, social media research and music industry research. My study may also benefit bands and artists, their labels and the music industry more generally, as it provides a better understanding of how Twitter can be used not only to engage with fans, but also to promote and market bands and their work. Individuals who

identify as fans may also benefit from this research as it considers fan activity from a variety of perspectives, gives fans a chance to be seen as active contributors who potentially have more power and agency, and improves understanding of how fans can use Twitter to interact and form connections with celebrities.

Literature Review

RQ1: According to the scholarly literature, what were the defining characteristics of celebrity-fan interactions in the context of mass media?

Although fans are often the most noticeable and visible group in the spectrum of media audiences, few researchers prior to the 1980s took them seriously (Lewis, 2002). For most of the 20th century, scholars wrote very little about fandom as a cultural and social phenomenon and what little literature has been written is generally in connection to a discussion of fame or celebrities (Jensen as cited in Lewis, 2002). Fans were thought to be a consequence of celebrity culture and a reaction to "the star system" (Jensen as cited in Lewis, 2002). With the emergence of popular culture studies, fandom came to refer to a subculture created by fans who share a common interest that usually pertains to mass-produced and distributed entertainment (Fiske, 1992). In industrial societies, fandom is an ordinary element of popular culture, yet it is often treated differently than the cultural practices of "normal" audiences (Fiske, 1992). Frequently associated with fans of pop music, Hollywood stars and romance novels, fandom has traditionally been belittled by the dominant value system (Fiske, 1992). Early fandom research held a negative view of fans, regarding them as "deviant alienated souls" (Jensen, 1992, p. 12). Much of the early scholarly literature on fans characterized them as fanatics who exhibit "excessive, bordering on deranged, behaviour" (Jensen, 1992, p.12). Additionally, the popular press often criticized and sensationalized fans, which contributed to public mistrust of fans

(Lewis, 2002). This view of fandom is not surprising given scholarly concerns about "media industry manipulation" and the notion that media audiences are "passive and controlled" (Lewis, 2002, p.1). Fandom, then, was traditionally stigmatized by "emphasizing danger, abnormality, and silliness" (Lewis, 2002, p. 2).

In her analysis of academic discourses about fandom, Jensen (1992) notes that fans are often perceived to be "pathological and deviant" (p. 9). Jensen (1992) also discusses two types of fans described in scholarly literature: the obsessed individual and the hysterical crowd. Fans categorized as deviant were seen as dangerous "others" who posed a threat to "regular" citizens (Jensen, 1992). Attributing fan obsessions to the influence of the media, scholars blamed excessive media coverage of the personal lives of celebrities for the erosion of standards of appropriate behaviour (Jensen, 1992). According to early scholarly literature, celebrities were the focus of artificial social relations for fans, who were misled into believing that they knew the "truth" about media figures and could develop personal connections with them (Jensen, 1992).

Since the rise of jazz culture in the early 20th century, scholars such as Adorno have given particular attention, and scorn, to music fans (Gracyk, 1992). Beginning in the 1950s, the teenage audiences for rock 'n' roll were regarded as unruly crowds in academic and media discourse and were portrayed as "animalistic and depraved, under the spell of their chosen musical form" (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 12). Although there are earlier examples of intense fandom and celebrity obsessions, such as the popular enthusiasm for Frank Sinatra and Elvis Presley, the Beatles brought with them a particularly visible and expansive form of fandom — a phenomenon termed Beatlemania (Lewis, 2002). The scale and intensity of Beatlemania exceeded earlier instances of star-centered "hysteria" and was difficult for scholars and commentators to comprehend (Lewis, 2002). Beatlemania was the first major music trend of the

sixties to involve adolescent girls (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). During its pinnacle years of 1964-65, Beatlemania resembled a social movement but instead of rioting for social change, fans were rioting for the opportunity to remain close to their idols (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). When in the vicinity of their idols, some fans would faint, urinate themselves, or break down emotionally (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). However, not many fans had the luxury of getting close enough to scream at their idols, so they would gather together to obsess over the Beatles and exchange cards or magazines (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002).

Beginning in England in 1963 with reports of mobs after concerts, large crowds at Heathrow Airport, and fights with police for tickets, Beatlemania quickly moved to the United States (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). Television had "spread the word" from England to the United States, helping American fans pick up where English fans had left off (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). When the Beatles arrived overseas, an estimated 10,000 girls greeted them at the airport and their hotel (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). Regardless of location, being a Beatles fan gave girls a "license to riot" (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 86). American Beatlemania quickly "reached the proportions of religious idolatry" (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 86). Upwards of 100 security guards were required at concerts to restrain crowds, making the conditions for the worshipped band increasingly unsafe (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). "Uncivilized" crowds reportedly made many venues and locations dangerous for both the Beatles and their fans (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). As a result, roughly three years after the beginning of Beatlemania, in 1966, the Beatles performed their final concert (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002). This made

them "the first musical celebrities to be driven from the stage by their own fans" (Ehrenreich, Hess & Jacobs, as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 86).

Although Beatlemania represents one of the first instances of so-called mass hysteria directed towards a musical group, the music industry has faced many other fan-driven obsessions since the 1960s. One Direction and Justin Bieber are just two of many modern examples of extreme fandom and star-centered "hysteria". One difference between these modern examples and the Beatles is that fan cultures can now interact with their idols on the internet. In other words, prior to the development of the internet, if fans could not swoon over their idols in person, watching them on television or listening to them on the radio were the next best thrills.,

Because of the prominent role of mass media in celebrity-fan interactions at this time, the media-audience relationship was characterized by Horton and Wohl in 1956 as "a form of parasocial interaction" (Lewis, 2002). This led to the development of Parasocial Interaction Theory (PSI), which refers to one-sided relationships between media users and media figures that can intensify to the point where users feel like they have created real friendships with media figures (Giles, 2002). PSI has been used to help understand the attachments that individuals develop with media characters, such as celebrities, actors, and presenters (Ballantine & Martin, 2005). In this respect, fandom was viewed as a "surrogate relationship" that mimicked ordinary relationships, albeit ineffectively (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 16). The media's mode of address was characterized as "simulation conversation" which "replicated the virtues of face-to-face interaction" (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002, p.16). Horton and Wohl suggested that parasocial interaction is an attempt by deprived and socially excluded groups to make up for the lack of "authentic" relationships in their lives (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002).

Early PSI research concentrated on television and radio, as these were the primary ways fans could connect with celebrities at the time. Parasocial interactions, then, were thought to mimic typical social relationships for the user (Levy, 1979). It was observed that media users would form opinions of media figures, which would then influence their feelings about the behaviour of these figures (Ballantine & Martin, 2005). According to PSI theory, parasocial relationships emerge when media users feel like they are truly meeting or co-present with media figures and have strong feelings of intimacy with those figures over time (Ballantine & Martin, 2005). Parasocial relationships, then, can intensify to the point where media users feel like they have developed actual friendships with media figures (Ballantine & Martin, 2005).

Since the 1950s, scholars have developed a range of interpretations of PSI. For example, Horton and Strauss (1957) suggested that PSI did not necessarily occur only through mediated channels like television or radio, but could also exist in concerts and other face-to-face contexts with large audiences. Co-presence, then, becomes a large contributing factor for PSI. Following this development, a number of studies were conducted on television audiences, all with similar findings. McQuail, Blumler, and Brown (1972) conducted a study of British television audiences and identified personal identity and companionship as essential functions of PSI. Similarly, Rosengran and Windahl (1972) argued that the essential purpose of PSI "was as a source of alternative companionship, resulting from 'deficiencies' in social life and dependency on television (i.e as compensation for loneliness)" (p. 122). This early research largely focused on television and believed that PSI best explained the appeal of media figures who address the viewer in a direct way, for example by looking into the camera (Cohen, 1999). In sum, within the context of radio and television, much early research explored this theory with a common focus

on celebrity-fan interactions as one-way communication designed to make fans feel like they have a personal relationship with the celebrity (Giles, 2002).

At this time, much PSI literature focused on television users. For example, in his analysis of local television news and older adult audiences, Levy (1979) found that viewers compare their own ideas with those of newscasters. Additionally, Rubin, Perse, and Powell (1985) suggested that when rating media figures, individuals use similar criteria as they do when encountering individuals in real life. Building off this, Rubin and McHugh (1987) found that "the media figure as a potential friend was a more important factor in developing a parasocial relationship than physical attraction" (p. 283). Closely related, Rubin and Perse (1987) argued that PSI "may arise from an altruistic human instinct to form attachments with others, at no matter how remote a distance" (p. 254). Conway and Rubin (1991) then suggested that PSI could be more of an influential factor for television viewing than the actual television content itself. Furthermore, the amount of time spent viewing television was found to correlate to PSI (Gleich, 1997). Comparing the quality of relationships with media figures to friends and neighbours using a rating scale, Gleich (1997) found that on some dimensions favourite media figures were rated higher than good neighbours (Gleich, 1997). Similarly, Cohen (1999) studied PSI between Arab and Jewish teenagers and characters from an Israeli soap opera and proposed that the favourite characters of teenagers were those they could relate to as pseudofriends, rather than characters they idolized. Thus, the common theme between all these scholars was that PSI sought to explain the power and influence of media over audiences.

Literature at this time focused on television and more specifically on media figures who directly address the viewer such as news anchors and talk show hosts (Cohen, 1999). This early literature shows that many PSI theorists conceptualized celebrity-fan interactions as exclusively

one-way. These one-way relationships were shaped by the limitations of mass media, but the "prolonged intimacy of parasocial interactions" had unanticipated consequences (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002, p.16). Some fans became frustrated by the limitations of parasocial interaction and attempted to develop personal relationships with media figures (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002). Because radio and television did not facilitate interpersonal contact and reciprocal interactions between celebrities and fans, fans often turned to letter-writing or fan mail to interact with celebrities at this time. Fan mail allowed fans to express themselves to celebrities in a way that television and radio did not. Technologically, radio and television broadcasting did not facilitate two-way communication and therefore writing letters appealed to fans seeking a means of expressing themselves and connecting with celebrities (Simmons, 2009).

Fan mail was a key source for audience's "perceived interaction" with media personalities (Simmons, 2009). In her analysis of thousands of letters sent to popular radio programs and personalities across the United States from 1923 to 1941, Simmons (2009) discovered that fans used letters to create and maintain connections with celebrities. Because these letters allowed fans to provide feedback, input, make requests, and provide information, "users' letters reflected dimensions of interactivity" albeit in a limited way (Simmons, 2009, p.444). Listeners wrote letters for a number of reasons: to comment, to address personal matters, to express emotion, to criticize, to praise, to correct errors and to suggest content (Simmons, 2009). Fan mail, then, allowed fans to talk back, resuming a two-way flow of communication in a mass media environment (Simmons, 2009). Instead of being restricted to simply listening or watching, fan mail had the potential to allow fans to participate more actively in the development of program content (Simmons, 2009). For example, fan letters kept the television program *Max Headroom* from being cancelled as the letters indicated audience support to television executives (Sabal, as

cited in Lewis, 2002). Despite certain successes, fan mail studies have reported that recipients typically paid little attention to letters they received (Simmons, 2009). For example, a fan letter sent to Nick Heyward— frontman of the 1980s band Haircut— shows a desperate fan trying to connect with her idol repeatedly with no success: "I have been writing you letters for over a year now and I have no idea who gets them. But whoever gets this PLEASE let it get to Nick Heyward!!!" (Lewis, 2002, p. 196). Therefore, fan mail was infrequently two-way or reciprocal, since fans who wrote to celebrities rarely received a response in return.

Fan mail was prevalent in a number of industries, including film, art, television, radio, and music. Within the music industry, fan mail became increasingly popular. Writing letters allowed fans to pour their hearts out to their favourite artists and bands in an incredibly personal manner (Lewis, 2002). For example, in a letter to Kate Bush— an English singer-songwriter popular during the 1980s— a fan explains that she is dying and how much Bush has meant to her over the years (Lewis, 2002). In this letter the fan explains all the details of her obsession with the singer, her many psychiatric appointments, and her never ending love for Bush (Lewis, 2002). Similarly, in a fan letter sent to David Bowie, a fan explains her drug addiction and how Bowie helped her (Lewis, 2002). She wrote: "I wanted to thank you for your help…although I still take the tablets as I realized my brain is addicted to them" (Lewis, 2002, p. 193). These letters suggest that fan mail offered fans the ability to write detailed and personal letters to their idols. Fan mail, then, involved storytelling and therapeutic functions. In this respect, fan mail was the primary way fans could interact with celebrities in a sincere and personal way. Fan mail allowed fans to share their personal stories with celebrities in a way that was not possible through TV, radio or film on their own.

Not only would fans write letters to celebrities, but they would also write to each other. This led to the development of a community in which fans could share opinions and feelings about celebrities which other people in their lives may not have understood (Lewis, 2002). For example, in a letter from one Barry Manilow fan to another, the fan writes: "you make it easier to bear— the friends I have made through Barry are the most loyal I've ever known…" (Lewis, 2002, p. 200). Examples such as this one suggest that fans used letters to discuss matters that were in some cases unrelated to celebrities, such as their work, school and personal problems (Lewis, 2002).

Although fan mail allowed fans to share aspects of their personal and emotional lives with celebrities, formulating these letters often took time. For example, in a letter to David Bowie, 16-year-old Alan writes "it has taken me 10 days to get this far and my mind has toyed with the idea for months before that" (Lewis, 2002, p. 196). In this respect, fan mail was a long and drawn out process. It would take time for the letter to be written, mailed and delivered, and longer still for the fan to hear back (in the rare instances where celebrities or those handling their publicity wrote back). Therefore, despite the existence of fan mail, scholarly literature characterized celebrity-fan interactions as primarily parasocial and one-way. Rarely were these interactions characterized as two-way communication; in academic and popular discourse about fandom, it was assumed that media figures were able to communicate with fans but not vice versa.

In sum, scholarly literature in the context of cinema, radio, television and other mass media characterized fans as individuals who tried to "live vicariously through the perceived lives of" celebrities (Schnickel as cited in Lewis, 2002). The literature from this time stated that "fans suffer from psychological inadequacy and are particularly vulnerable to media influence and

crowd contagion" (Lewis, 2002, p. 3). It was argued that the mass media lured individuals with impoverished lives into fantasies of contact with celebrities as an imaginary solution to problems in their lives (Lewis, 2002). The literature rarely examined the ordinary social and cultural functions of fan activities and discourses (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002). Rather, fans were characterized as loners romantically obsessed with celebrities and suffering from a media-induced contagion (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002). This view held that media manipulation led fans to obsess over their illusory and pathological relationships with celebrities.

RQ2: According to more recent literature, how are social media helping to reshape celebrity-fan relationships and interactions today?

Unlike earlier scholarly literature that painted a negative picture of fans, scholarly literature published after the development of the internet has suggested that defining fans as obsessed, abnormal, irrational, deviant and destructive is unhelpful for understanding the social functions of fan-celebrity communication for the industry and for fans (Lewis, 2002). Instead, more current scholarly literature paints fandom more positively and tries to differentiate fans from common audience members and consumers (Lewis, 2002). This literature sees fans as "ordinary individuals who have become more active participants in popular culture" (Jensen, as cited in Lewis, 2002). Additionally, the literature suggests that celebrity-fan relationships have become more reciprocal with the emergence of the internet and social media.

Every generation has had an equivalent to the Beatles, from Donny Osmond to Justin Timberlake to Justin Bieber (Shapiro, 2010). Justin Bieber is a particularly interesting example because he built his entire career through social media. Unlike many modern examples of stars discovered through television programs, Justin Bieber was discovered through social media (Shapiro, 2010). Videos posted to YouTube by his mother of him performing at a talent show

were circulated through sites like MySpace and Facebook, leading the world to know about the talented boy before record companies (Shapiro, 2010). Once discovered and signed to a record label, social media platforms helped Bieber rise to a world-famous pop star. With Bieber being chased down and mobbed by crowds of screaming girls, his fans exhibited many traits similar to Beatle fans (Shapiro, 2010). However, Justin was able to interact with his fans in a way that the Beatles could not. He turned to Twitter to update fans on any element of his life, no matter how routine or extreme (Shapiro, 2010). Bieber could be seen as "a by-product of the Twitter age" (Shapiro, 2010, p. 4).

In anticipation of his debut album *My World* being released in 2009, Bieber's management decided he would make an appearance at a mall to meet with fans and promote his upcoming album (Shapiro, 2010). Although there had been some instances of "hysteria" with adolescent girls crying, screaming, and making every attempt to get close to Justin, this mall appearance brought with it something security didn't even expect (Shapiro, 2010). A stampede erupted, injuring people and ultimately resulting in the event being cancelled (Shapiro, 2010). "Bieber Fever" was in full effect. Following this event, Bieber turned to Twitter, apologizing to his fans and promising to make it up to them (Shapiro, 2010). This example shows that although Bieber's fans exhibited many of the same characteristics as fans pre-internet, Justin and his fans could connect through social media in more personal and reciprocal ways. Bieber communicated with his fans primarily through Twitter, allowing them to get to know him more personally and form what fans felt were closer bonds. Beatlemania and Bieber Fever have many similarities, however social media further intensified the obsessions fans formed with Bieber and allowed him to connect with his fans in ways the Beatles could not. Without social media, Justin Bieber might not be the pop-star we know today. As an example, Justin Bieber shows that online

communities, such as Twitter, can be highly influential in the growth and success of artists and bands today.

Looking at how parasocial relationships develop in online communities, Ballantine and Martin (2005) explored web pages as a platform for users to communicate ideas. Their findings suggest that the ubiquity of the internet—or the notion that it will always be there for users to use whenever they wish— has allowed users to become more familiar with the personal characteristics of celebrities, which has led to the increasing involvement of users on online communities (Ballantine & Martin, 2005). This attachment has allowed celebrity-fan relationships to develop and intensify considerably (Ballantine & Martin, 2005). Unlike television and radio, the interactivity of the internet has arguably intensified the illusion of intimacy between media user and media figure (Ballantine & Martin, 2005).

Recent PSI research has also explored the manner in which the interactivity of social media is changing and intensifying celebrity-fan interactions. Thorson and Rodgers (2006) used parasocial interaction theory to examine how political candidates use the interactivity of blogs to persuade audiences. While the authors defined parasocial interactions as an illusion of intimacy with a media personality, they concluded that social media platforms such as blogs provide a public forum for users to post opinions to candidates who occasionally respond, which demonstrates that communication between media figures and audiences is not exclusively one-way as early PSI researchers assumed (Thorson & Rodgers, 2006). As Thorson and Rodgers argue, media figures – in this case, political candidates – increasingly use the interactive nature of social media to contact users directly in an attempt to influence their voting decisions (Thorson & Rodgers, 2006). Although Thorson and Rodgers focus specifically on blogs, their case study is suggestive of the transformative potential of social media more broadly.

Within fandom research, Baym (1999) conducted one of the first studies involving fans and their use of the internet. In this study, Baym (1999) used her own experience as a member of a soap opera fan culture to discuss online communities. She would routinely watch soap operas and log on to an internet userbase to read messages about the program as well as contribute to the conversation (Baym, 1999). Through her analysis of this online community, Baym (1999) discovered that users have a strong sense of community. This led her to wonder how individuals who meet in person infrequently, if at all, could create a social world that mimicked a legitimate community (Baym, 1999). She compared soap opera fan clubs to events like family reunions, in the sense that authentic social relationships develop among fans (Baym, 1999). Furthermore, she noted that participating in the discussions about television shows was just as important to fans as viewing the shows (Baym, 1999). In this sense, the programs can be understood as channels for social interaction (Baym, 1999). If, as Baym argues, fans are drawn to fan communities primarily because they offer social interaction, then it is no surprise that social media have become a key means for developing those interactions. Although Baym (1999) does not focus on fan communities in the music industry, her emphasis on the forms of social interaction that fan communities offer to members could be extended to fan communities in the music industry.

Like Baym, Patryk Galuszka (2015) considers the influence of digital media on fandom, but with a focus on the new economy of fandom and the changing role of audiences in the contemporary music market. This new economy involves empowered fan communities who no longer have to rely on established and official communication channels in the traditional music industry but can instead use social media as a platform for democratizing communication about music commodities and for developing relationships with artists (Galuszka, 2015). This new economy of fandom has led to the emergence of new kinds of relationships between fans and

artists and new roles for fans as sponsors, investors, stakeholders, filters, and co-creators of

value. Like Baym's work, Galuszka's study is suggestive of social media's potential to allow fans

and artists to interact and form relationships that are to some extent outside of industry channels.

In this way, the new economic structures of popular music fandom and the use of social media

are leading to new scholarly definitions of fandom which recognize fans as co-creators of

content. While Galuszka does not directly address Parasocial Interaction Theory, many of his

ideas can be contrasted with early PSI. His main argument – that the new economy of fandom is

facilitated by tools like social media which allow artists to communicate more directly with fans

in a reciprocal way – offers a view of celebrity-fan relationships that diverges from PSI's focus

on one-way communication in such relationships. By arguing that the internet has allowed for the

growth of fan communities, Galuszka raises the possibility that traditional interpretations of

fandom and of the nature of celebrity-fan interactions may need to be reassessed in light of the

growing importance of social media in this context.

   In keeping with the discussion of fandom within the music industry, Mark Duffet (2014)

takes a cultural studies approach in his examination of how recent media developments enable

change in popular music fandom. Duffet acknowledges past interpretations of fandom as

consisting of overly attached and easily influenced audiences but then goes on to develop his

study based on more recent scholarship that abandons this perspective. He notes that theories of

mass culture informed the view that celebrity-fan relationships are largely one-way, imagined

relationships. Duffet uses examples such as the folk music movement and the Beatles's *Sgt.*

Pepper album to show how popular music increasingly came to be seen as a politicized art form,

which then led to new interpretations of fans in academic and popular discourse. Duffet (2014)

then highlights another shift in the mediascape— the introduction of the internet – which helped

increase the visibility of fan communities and acted as an archive for storing a wide-range of material. According to Duffet (2014), by blurring the lines between producers and consumers, the internet has transformed fandom by promoting a sense of collaborative democracy which has in turn inspired new scholarly conceptualizations of celebrity-fan interactions. In contrast to early academic literature on fans, Duffet (2014) argues that new media bring fans together publicly and visibly, facilitate political engagement and creative activity, and foster reciprocal communication between artists and fans.

Not all scholars agree that social media have had a positive impact on fandom. Paul Booth (2015), for example, argues that digital media have helped fandom become a mainstream, marketed commodity. Today, anyone can create a Twitter profile and become a contributing member to online discussions, which could result in a loss of distinction for fans (Booth, 2015). Booth (2015) sees fandom as becoming commoditized as wider audiences are increasingly engaging as fans. Therefore, although he acknowledges the power of social media for celebrity-fan interactions, Booth (2015) offers a critique of the assumption that social media are inherently beneficial and emphasizes the manner in which the internet influences individual fans in different ways. While the internet may facilitate emotional attachment to media figures, the internet also plays an important role in meaning-making, nostalgia, novelty, pastiche and parody (Booth, 2015). Like Galuszka (2015) and Duffet (2014), Booth references Henry Jenkins' (2003) notion of "participatory culture" which conceptualizes fans as both active audiences and media producers, although Booth's commodification argument challenges Jenkins' more optimistic view.

As recent PSI and fandom research demonstrates, new media forms have allowed for increased participation on the part of the user. According to Jenkins, a new participatory culture

is emerging in which individuals no longer simply consume cultural products but also act as cultural producers and are now widely referred to as "prosumers" (Jenkins, 2003). In this respect, "media fans are consumers who also produce, readers who also write and spectators who also participate" (Jenkins as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 208). Whereas earlier audience research regarded audiences as passive consumers, Jenkins' work exemplifies the notion that audiences are actively involved in cultural production and are not confined to "relations of consumption" (Jenkins as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 208) Distinguishing fans from common audience members, Jenkins' calls attention to the "distinctive interpretations, evaluation criteria and alternative identities" made clear in the "texts" produced by fans (Jenkins as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 208). Jenkins illustrates that what arises from fan productions is an inclination to "appropriate" and redo "industrial texts according to self-proclaimed priorities" (Jenkins as cited in Lewis, 2002, p. 209). The new discourse of fans includes making light of the negative interpretations of fans articulated by scholars, the public, and the press.

Jenkins' (2003) analysis of the grassroots appropriation of *Star Wars* as one of the first examples of participatory culture suggests that media users are active participants in cultural production. He sees the cultural works produced by media users as valuable for digital cinema and other industries. Jenkins analysis of short films and other media products produced by fans of *Star Wars* illustrates the manner in which fans in participatory culture routinely rework media products and personalities.

Discussing YouTube as an example of participatory culture, Burgess and Green (2013) investigate participatory culture in closer detail by analyzing surveys of YouTube's most popular content. In doing so, they are able to develop foundational knowledge about the different ways individuals use the platform. By looking closely at how individuals use YouTube, their study

allows for a better understanding of the ways in which participatory culture operates and of the manner in which social media sites, such as YouTube, allow individuals to both consume and produce their own content. Although not specific to Twitter, this source helps illustrate how new media and social media platforms in particular allow audiences to both consume and produce their own content.

As Jenkins and other scholars illustrate, earlier scholarly interpretations of fans as juveniles who are easily manipulated, passive, and distracted are no longer the norm in fan studies (Grossberg as cited in Lewis, 2002). Instead, fans are now considered by many scholars to be active individuals who appropriate texts and give them their own meaning (Grossberg as cited in Lewis, 2002). Thus, scholars have begun to acknowledge that audiences often have active and productive relationships with popular texts (Grossberg as cited in Lewis, 2002). Rather than audiences consisting of cultural dupes, fans are generally aware that media messages can be powerful and manipulative (Grossberg as cited in Lewis, 2002). Fans are now empowered to make a difference, to develop their own identity, produce their own content, and essentially maintain control over their lives (Grossberg as cited in Lewis, 2002).

Similarly, John Fiske argues that all audiences become involved with production and not simply reception, but that fans accomplish a more extensive amount of "producerly activity" (Fiske as cited in Lewis, 2002). He proposes that fans generally focus on popular culture because industrially-produced texts inspire audience members to participate and develop their own identities (Fiske as cited in Lewis, 2002). Additionally Lewis (2002) contends that credit should be given to fans for reacting with optimism, creativity, and energy, to situations that are often prejudiced. By participating in fandom, fans create intelligible identifications for themselves (Grossberg as cited in Lewis, 2002). In sum, more recent scholarly literature has suggested that

fandom offers fans a sense of empowerment— thanks largely to the development of social media.

Despite recent scholarly arguments that celebrity-fan interactions are changing, these changes are not necessarily all positive. Allowing for a consideration of the power and influence of the media over audiences, Morley (1993) provides a valuable examination of competing scholarly perspectives of media audiences as both passive and active. Morley (1993) does not want to return to the model of audiences as cultural dupes, but rather urges caution in regards to active audience theory. Morley (1993) notes that although recent literature on audience studies sees the audience as always active and media content always open to interpretation, scholars must be cognizant that an active audience is not always synonymous with a powerful one. He notes that we must factor in the power and influence of the media over its users (Morley, 1993). By identifying some of the limitations of active audience theory, Morley (1993) enables a more comprehensive analysis of fan cultures. By considering both sides of the debate, Morley acknowledges that not all audience activity is necessarily empowering for audiences. Although Morley is writing before the development of social media, his arguments can be applied to the social media context.

Further challenging the narrow view that sees all media users as active participants and which disregards the role of media personalities and organizations in shaping culture, Deller (2011) offers a more critical approach that considers both the participatory nature of new media as well as its power. The focus of Deller's (2011) study is on Twitter users who engage with the news, discuss television programs, and create content (Deller, 2011). Deller (2011) suggests that Twitter allows media producers to gather information about and influence the relationship between audiences and media due to the platform's liveliness, interactivity, openness to

participation, and convergence (Deller, 2011). Building off of Jenkins work, Deller (2011) identifies Twitter as a platform that allows for the convergence between producers and consumers to occur.

Although Deller (2011) acknowledges the participatory nature of Twitter, she cautions against seeing social media as inherently participatory. She notes issues of power and control in Twitter and argues that it is not as democratic of a space as it may appear (Deller, 2011). This is because of the presence of corporate accounts and promoted tweets that lead to differing levels of power and influence across users (Deller, 2011). The specific case study that Deller (2011) analyzes involves the producer of a television program who uses Twitter to engage with his viewers by discussing content and attempting to influence their viewing habits. This idea relates to recent PSI and fandom research that sees the potential for celebrity-fan interactions to be reciprocal. Thus, despite scholarly arguments that social media are changing celebrity-fan interactions by making them more reciprocal, these changes are not necessarily all positive. In some instances, user activity in social media can be seen as giving celebrities more control and power over fans. Despite audiences becoming more active with the development of social media, this does not guarantee that they are in control of that media space.

Methodology

The aforementioned literature review assisted in answering RQ1 and RQ2. My review of PSI and fandom literature published prior to the birth of the internet identified common themes in scholarly conceptualizations of celebrity-fan interactions at this time. Revisiting literature on fan mail as well was also helpful for understanding how fans attempted to use interpersonal media to extend celebrity-fan interactions. In order to contrast celebrity-fan relationships of the television and radio era with those that have emerged through social media, I referenced

literature published after the birth of the internet, which revealed a range of perspectives through which scholars now view celebrity-fan interactions. This allowed for a comparison to be made between the nature of celebrity-fan interactions before and after the development of the internet and social media.

This literature review followed the design of a scoping study, which is "guided by a requirement to identify all relevant literature regardless of study design" (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005, p. 22). It supplied an extensive review of literature that was available and discovered a number of gaps (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005). In doing so, five stages were followed. I identified my research questions, identified relevant studies and then decided on my study selection (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005). I then charted the data, which assisted me in interpreting and "sorting material according to key issues and themes" (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005, p. 26). In doing so, key themes in the literature were identified that formed the categories of the codebook used in conducting the textual analysis. In the subsequent section, the codes developed from these categories are applied to Twitter conversations between celebrities and fans. Finally, I collate, summarize, and report the results. This approach allows me to present my findings in two ways: through the relevant literature identified and through a textual analysis involving categories/themes developed from the literature. My results are organized around the eleven categories and sub-categories drawn from the literature.

Building on this literature review, I extend the comparison between pre-internet mass media and post-internet social media and conduct a textual analysis of Twitter conversations and code for words and phrases that signify the themes identified in the literature. Twitter has been chosen as the social media platform for this analysis because of its liveliness, interactivity,

participation and convergence (Deller, 2011). Its text-based format allows for increased audience feedback, leading bands to use this platform when attempting to engage with fans.

The categories of my coding scheme were developed to see if any of the characteristics of celebrity-fan interactions identified in the literature are evident in social media conversations. In performing this textual analysis, I recorded the amount of times celebrities respond to fans and code the details of these responses. I then analyzed the discourse used by bands/artists when interacting with fans, which provided insight into how and why celebrities interact with fans on Twitter. Collecting this data involved manually selecting 40 tweets from the three bands/artists selected. The bands/artists selected for this analysis are The Arkells, Banners, and Rachel Platten. These bands/artists were chosen based on their social media presence and fan engagement. Furthermore, they were selected because they all have verified, popular and well-established Twitter accounts. Although they all have verified accounts, they each have less than 100,000 followers, indicating that they are still operating on a relatively small scale and can be considered emerging artists. Emerging artists were chosen because the likelihood of them running their own Twitter accounts is much higher than large-scale celebrities who often have teams running their social media accounts. These bands/artists were also selected because they are all signed to major Canadian labels and can all be classified, for the most part, under the same broad genre of music: pop. Although the Arkells and Banners are both considered pop/rock and Rachel Platten more straightforwardly as pop, they each have a similar following and target a similar demographic. In selecting these bands/artists, it was important that they were classified under the same genre of music, as the scope of this study will not allow my findings to be generalizable to all genres.

My sampling frame consisted of approximately the most recent month of tweets from each band/artist. Using systematic random sampling, I selected every fifth tweet of each band/artist in order to select 40 tweets per band/artist. Selecting the most recent tweets of each artist as my sampling frame enabled the study to be as current as possible. The detailed coding of tweets and sentiment analysis that was performed can be found in the attached appendix. In addition to facilitating a textual analysis, I also performed a sentiment analysis of the selected tweets (coding for positive, negative, and neutral tweets) to gain insight into the attitudes and feelings of Twitter users. This allowed for a more detailed analysis of the emotions conveyed through celebrity-fan interactions.

Analysis/Results

RQ3: To what extent are the characteristics that scholars associate with celebrity-fan interactions and relationships reflected in actual Twitter conversations between fans and celebrities?

In order to answer this research question, a textual analysis of 40 tweets per band/artist was performed. This textual analysis involved the coding of tweets based off of the following categories. The first of these categories is *two-sided*, which refers to reciprocal interactions between fans and celebrities whereby the celebrity/artist responds to the tweet(s) of fans. Within this category there are two sub-categories. The first of these is *one-to-one*, which refers to reciprocal interactions where the band directly addresses and communicates with an individual fan. The second sub-category is *one-to-many* and refers to reciprocal interactions where the band is directly addressing fans but may be responding to, or communicating with, a larger audience.

Figure 1. An example of a one-to-one tweet from one of the analyzed artists.

Figure 2. An example of a one-to-many tweet from one of the analyzed bands.

The second category of this coding scheme is *one-sided*, which refers to tweets and retweets that are exclusively one-sided since there are no replies. These are often broadcasted messages from the band to the audience at large. They are often initiated by the band/artist and sent out on their own accord and are not replying to fans or communicating directly to them. The third category is *personal connection*, which refers to tweets that are of a somewhat personal nature, referring to individual fan's characteristics and events usually independent of band-related topics. This category is often reflected through bands using the names of fans, or informally addressing them directly. The fourth category is *self-promotion/use*, which refers to

tweets from bands that involve business ventures of the band and their agenda. It involves instances where the artists refer to themselves (e.g. "we", "us") as they attempt to promote something relating to their business agenda. Within this category, the sub-category *informational* refers to tweets that are simply informational and do not necessarily try to promote.

The fifth category is *emotional connection*, which refers to tweets where sentiments and feelings are expressed (e.g. love, like, awesome, great). This category may also involve the use of emoticons. The sixth category is *companionship*, which involves feelings of intimacy at a distance, whereby fans and artists articulate friendship. This is indicated by a sense of closeness and feelings of togetherness. It may also refer to actual in-person interactions. The seventh category is *persuasiveness*, which involves bands using the interactivity of Twitter to persuade and influence fans to engage with their band on various business levels. Finally, the eighth category is *collaboration/participation/convergence*. This category refers to tweets and interactions on Twitter whereby the band/artist and the fans collaborate to produce content. This may either involve the band/artist asking for collaboration and participation, or fans presenting content to the band/artist.

After applying this coding scheme and performing the textual analysis, a number of patterns emerged. First, it was interesting to note that the *two-sided* category, appearing 69 times, was more prevalent than the *one-sided* category, appearing 53 times. This finding conforms to the view in recent scholarly literature that Twitter and other social media are contributing to changes in celebrity-fan interactions by making them more reciprocal. Although the two-sided category was more prevalent overall across all three bands/artists, individually it was not. For the Arkells and Rachel Platten, the *two-sided* category and *one-sided* category appeared the same number of times. The tweets of Banners though were overwhelmingly in favour of two-sided

interactions. These differing results show that although Twitter does allow for more two-sided interactions to occur, bands use Twitter for this purpose at their discretion. Although the Arkells and Rachel Platten did use Twitter to interact with fans, they also used it to broadcast messages more generally.

Within these two-sided interactions, more of these tweets were *one-to-one* than *one-to-many*. However, the difference was not significant. The fact that *one-to-one* was more prevalent lends support to the view in recent scholarly literature that Twitter is changing celebrity-fan interactions, not only by encouraging reciprocal interactions but also by enabling more personal, intimate conversations that may be more meaningful to both participants than broadcasted messages. That being said, the bands/artists frequently used Twitter's reply/retweet function when interacting with fans. This function allows Twitter users to reply to mentions and in doing so retweet the original reply, broadcasting their response to all of their followers. In this respect, replies are less personal and intimate and can function as *one-to-many* communication. This suggests that although bands/artists are using Twitter to form more personal one-to-one connections, they are also still using it to broadcast messages to larger audiences.

The most prevalent of all of the subsequent categories was *personal connection,* which appeared 90 times in total. This category was most prevalent with Banners at 38 tweets, followed by Rachel Platten at 28, and finally the Arkells at 24. Again, this shows that there is variation across bands/artists. In these tweets, the bands/artists often attempted to form personal connections with fans by using their names or informally addressing them directly. In doing so, the bands/artists are identifying individual fans and communicating with them personally, as opposed to conversing with a large group of unidentified fans as claimed by early PSI and fandom literature. Discussions unrelated to the band, such as restaurant recommendations,

suggest that these bands/artists use Twitter to get to know their fans on a more personal level. Conversations that have little to do with the agenda of the band may suggest that bands are using Twitter to build connections for reasons beyond profit. Because *personal connection* was the category that appeared most frequently, this finding is in line with arguments in the literature about changes facilitated by media, and more specifically, with the claim that social media facilitate more personalized or individualized celebrity-fan interactions than those of television and radio.

Figure 3. An example of a personal connection tweet from one of the analyzed artists.

The next most prevalent category was the *self-promotion/use* category, which appeared 23 times with the sub-category *informational* appearing 10 times. This category was used to inform fans about band-related matters and to promote the agenda of the band. In this respect, *self-promotion/use* highlights the degree to which Twitter is used for the commercial benefit of the band. Nevertheless, the *informational* category was not used to promote the agenda of the bands/artists but rather to respond to questions that related to band matters. Interestingly, this category occasionally appeared in combination with the *personal connection* category, which made this self-promotion less formal and blunt. The use of these two categories together implied

that the bands/artists were perhaps downplaying their self-promotional motivations by attempting to make personal connections with fans. By almost always involving the use of words such as "we" and "us," it appeared as though the band was trying to use these interactions to maintain the focus on their band, and in doing so self-promote. It seems plausible and unsurprising that bands and artists used the interactive nature of Twitter for their personal benefit.

Rachel Platten @RachelPlatten · May 5
I've always wanted to be in a killer flash mob. Thanks for letting my song #standbyyou be in yours @nbcheartbeat 🙌

Figure 4. An example a self-promotion/use tweet in combination with a personal connection tweet from one of the analyzed artists.

Personal connection may be a sincere attempt to build relationships, but its frequent pairing with self-promotion routinely calls this sincerity into question. Although the personal connection category appearing the most indicates that celebrity-fan interactions may have changed since early scholarly interpretations, the use of these two categories in combination with each other leads one to wonder if bands/artists are attempting to form personal connections in an effort to better promote their personal agendas. It is difficult to determine motives based on short tweets but at the very least these observed patterns do raise the question of whether interpersonal tweets may have both relationship-building and promotional functions. In Twitter discourse, the two functions may not necessarily be in tension with each other but rather support each other. Thus, at this point it cannot be concluded that Twitter allows celebrity-fan interactions and relationships to be exclusively personal.

Similarly, the *emotional connection* category also appeared 23 times. Although this is a relatively high frequency, the interactions were often very brief, with only one-word or

emoticons being used. Typically, when *emotional connection* tweets appeared in a conversation, the discussion tended to be unrelated to music or other band-related topics. These tweets often involved reactions from the band to posts by fans. Even though these interactions were rather brief, the number of *emotional connection* tweets illustrates that at least some fans are able to develop emotional connections with celebrities to a greater extent than early literature would suggest. More recent scholarly literature claims that social media, and more specifically Twitter, are capable of changing the nature of celebrity-fan interactions by allowing more emotional-connections to develop (even if infrequently) and the amount of content coded in this sample as *emotional connection* appears to support that claim. However, the short nature of these interactions raises questions about the sincerity of these emotional-connections. Are they just a quick way for bands to acknowledge fans and encourage loyalty or are bands and fans sharing an emotional experience of some kind? In sum, this category suggests that social media allows more emotional connections to be communicated between celebrities and fans than early literature suggested, however analyzing the sincerity or perceived sincerity of these emotional-connections was beyond the scope of this study.

Figure 5. An example of an emotional-connection tweet from one of the analyzed artists.

The next most prevalent category was *collaboration/participation/convergence*, which appeared 13 times across the three accounts. This category involved either the band/artist asking

31

fans for content, such as images and videos, or the fans presenting such content to the bands/artists. The finding of 13 instances of this category indicates that Twitter allows fans not only to consume but also produce content to some extent, which is in line with theories of participatory culture and what Jenkins refers to as "prosumers." As bands increasingly turn to fans for their content, Twitter is one of the platforms used to encourage and facilitate the co-creation of content, which is a key element of participatory culture. This category also included the use of contests to engage fans. Interestingly, during the time of this analysis, both the Arkells and Rachel Platten were conducting contests. Rachel Platten's involved fans sending in videos of themselves with someone who "makes their world a better place." Rachel then featured some of these clips in her music video. In this respect social media has allowed fans to not only become co-creators of content but also co-creators of the images of celebrities. Similarly, to market their new single, the Arkells organized a contest encouraging fans to write in to receive a "student card" from a fictional high school run by the Arkells. Fans would receive an acceptance letter in the mail, complete with a student card with their picture on it.

Figure 6. An example of a collaboration/participation/convergence tweet from one of the analyzed bands.

Although these contests involved fans actively participating in content production, the contests were used for the benefit of the band/artist. These contests often involved the promotion of a new single or album, suggesting that bands/artists may use fan content and participation as a way to promote and market themselves. Furthermore, by asking fans for pictures from concerts, this type of tweet helped to generate free promotional material from fans. While the bands' intentions are unclear, the number of tweets in this category suggests that fans have become more actively involved in content production and powerful in influencing the way bands promote themselves— elements that were not identified in early fandom literature that portrayed fans as simply passive viewers.

The least prevalent categories were *companionship*, appearing 2 times, and *persuasiveness*, which did not appear at all. Although *companionship* did appear twice, it was rather difficult to measure and observe. When it did appear, it primarily referred to meeting in person. By showing that Twitter is a platform that can facilitate real-life interactions, this result suggests that celebrity-fan interactions may have changed since early scholarly work in this area. Early literature identified celebrity-fan interactions as poor imitations of real social relationships, but the appearance of *companionship* in the sample suggests that perhaps Twitter has the potential to allow celebrity-fan relationships to be built and maintained in a similar way as ordinary friendships. Nevertheless, the infrequent appearance of this category in the sample illustrates that Twitter is rarely used for this purpose. Although tweets in this category were uncommon, the few examples that were found in the sample suggest that Twitter has the

capability of changing the nature of celebrity-fan interactions by allowing more typical social

relationships to occur.

Figure 7. An example of a companionship tweet from one of the analyzed artists.

Finally, although *persuasiveness* did not appear at all during this analysis, its absence is

an interesting result in itself. It is somewhat surprising that most of these tweets did not involve

the bands/artists attempting to persuade fans to do something. Although contests could in some

respect be considered a form of persuasion because they are offering fans something in return for

an action, within the context of these two contests I am not classifying them as such. This is

because in both contests the band/artist did not require the fan to buy anything to participate and

participation was completely voluntary. Scholarly literature within the context of mass-media

viewed celebrities as exercising a great deal of power over fans – to the point where media

personalities and the organizations behind them were able to persuade and control their

followers. The absence of tweets in the *persuasiveness* category suggests that perhaps

bands/artists no longer wield this degree of power over their fans. Social media may instead

enhance the agency and power of fans, and in doing so social media may result in more personal

and meaningful relationships between celebrities and fans. These findings suggest that although

bands can use Twitter to influence and persuade fans, the platform is generally not being used for

this purpose. Celebrity-fan interactions may be less oriented toward persuasion than early

literature claimed.

These results illustrate that bands use Twitter for a multitude of purposes and that celebrity-fan interactions vary depending on the band and the fans. Across these categories certain overarching patterns became evident. Primarily, a significant amount of the aforementioned categories overlapped within the various tweets. Tweets rarely fit into just one category; instead categories were often used in combination with each other. For example, many tweets involved both *personal connection* and *self-promotion/use*. This suggests that bands and fans interact in a number of different ways that simultaneously build relationships and serve commercial functions such as promotion. Furthermore, informal language was used in virtually every tweet. For example, "ya" was used instead of "you", or "tix" instead of "tickets". This informal language suggests a flattening of hierarchy and a conversation between peers. Perhaps this is because of Twitter's 140 character limit, or perhaps this is because this platform allows bands to engage with fans in more casual ways than traditional media has permitted.

In addition to this textual analysis, my study also involved a sentiment analysis. The first category of this sentiment analysis was *positive* tweets. This included tweets using exciting language, exclamation points, or happy emoticons. The next category involved neutral tweets, which consisted of tweets that were neither overly positive nor negative; they did not use overly expressive language or show excitement through punctuation or emoticons. The final category involved *negative* tweets, which included sad or otherwise emotionally-negative language or emoticons. The sentiment analysis revealed that two-sided interactions were largely neutral or positive. This suggests that bands refrain from replying to negative comments and avoid becoming involved in negative discussions. Rather, bands/artists tend to use Twitter to encourage positive interactions and connections. Positive tweets involved emotional and personal

connections primarily, whereas neutral tweets were largely informative and used for self-promotion and did not necessarily entail an overt attempt to persuade or influence fans.

Furthermore, the large majority of the one-sided tweets were informational, with the goal of self-promotion, and neutral, with not as much sentiment expressed as in reciprocal interactions. Because these one-sided tweets involve the band reaching a larger audience instead of responding to the specific tweets of fans, they are not as tailored to individual fans. Therefore, it appears as though reciprocal interactions between celebrities and fans are more positive and use more emotive language than do one-sided interactions. Thus, the results of this sentiment analysis suggest that reciprocal interactions between fans and bands largely consist of positive words and tones. This could be interpreted as a way of influencing fans, by persuading them to contribute to an overall positive discourse. In essence, if you want a reply, be positive.

Although there were more two-sided tweets than one-sided within the sampling frame, not all tweets were reciprocal in nature and not all tweets received responses from the bands/artists. The prevalence of two-sided interactions within this sample is highly suggestive of changes in the dynamics of celebrity-fan communication that have occurred since the early scholarly literature. By allowing more reciprocal interactions to occur, these results suggest that Twitter may open new possibilities of scholarly interpretations of celebrity-fan interactions. Although these findings show that celebrity-fan interactions have become more reciprocal than early literature identified, bands/artists still used Twitter to broadcast messages to large audiences. Therefore, certain elements of early scholarly literature on fandom and PSI, such as its one-sided aspect, still proliferate to some extent within the context of celebrity-fan interactions today. Because bands decide how they use Twitter, certain fans may be able to have reciprocal conversations with bands/artists, whereas other fans may not. Bands/artists reply to

tweets that interest them and strike them as positive in tone. Consequently, some fans are left with only one-way interactions and do not make the same connections with bands as others do. Thus, these results suggest that there are significant exceptions to the two-sided, reciprocal pattern that predominates in the Twitter sample.

Discussion

The aforementioned results suggest many differences between celebrity-fan interactions in the pre-social media period to those in the post-social media period, however certain similarities became apparent. For example, there are significant parallels between fan mail and Twitter conversations. Fans wrote letters to celebrities for similar reasons as fans who now tweet celebrities. As discussed in the scholarly literature, letters to celebrities were often very personal and attempted to make emotional connections. The preceding Twitter analysis revealed similar themes. Additionally, parallels between dimensions of interactivity exist (Simmons, 2009). For example, during the height of radio's popularity, radio stations often asked listeners to provide input to be included in radio programs (Simmons, 2009). Listeners, then, often wrote letters to suggest improvements and content ideas (Simmons, 2009). This encouragement of audience participation is similar to participatory culture, and the collaboration/participation/convergence category identified many instances of this type of participation in the Twitter analysis. Feedback was often provided by listeners upon the request of radio broadcasters (Simmons, 2009), which is similar to Twitter conversations where the bands and artists analyzed in my study often asked fans for feedback and content. Twitter discourse, then, appears to borrow or model itself on techniques of audience inclusion from the mass media period.

In both fan mail and Twitter conversations, audiences made requests and asked questions. One key difference, however, is that Twitter allows this process to occur faster. On Twitter, fans

expect a quick response. This was evident in tweets where fans asked bands questions on the day of concerts, such as set times. Conversely, letters had to be composed, delivered, and responded to over a much longer period of time. Another similarity between the two methods of communication exists in their ability to track trends and monitor system use. During the early days of broadcast radio, stations used fan mail to track listening trends and monitor system use (Simmons, 2009). Similarly, Twitter analytics allow various trends to be tracked and statistics to be collected, the main difference again being the immediacy of Twitter. Therefore, although parallels in content between fan mail and Twitter do exist, there are still some significant differences between the two.

The main difference between these two methods of communication is the amount of time fan mail took versus the nearly instantaneous nature of Twitter. Not only was fan mail a long process, but fans were also constrained by television and radio program times. Fans had to wait for these programs to even get a glance of their idols, whereas Twitter allows fans to connect with their idols whenever they please. Because tweets can be formulated in a matter of seconds, Twitter appeals to a broad range of individuals. Conversely, because letters took longer to write, writing them was not as common as Twitter usage. As discussed by Paul Booth (2015) this may result in a loss of distinction for fans who use Twitter, whereas letter writing distinguished hardcore fans from other fans. Writing fan mail, sending it, and waiting for a potential response was a lengthy process. On the off chance that fan mail was responded to, it was not immediately available to the fan as Twitter responses are today. Twitter's convenience, speed, and accessibility can be seen as contributing factors to the increase in interactions between celebrities and fans. Although much of the content may be similar to fan mail, Twitter allows celebrities and fans to interact more frequently.

Fan mail, television and radio created the perception of interactivity on the part of the user. Although fans were writing letters, which made celebrity-fan relationships at this time more interactive for the fan, letters rarely received a direct reply. Although the fan may have felt like they were interacting with celebrities, fan mail was still primarily one-way communication. Twitter, however, has allowed these interactions to be played out on a much larger scale. This is evident in the results of the Twitter analysis that showed that celebrities do in fact respond to fans. Although interactions are more common on Twitter than they were in the age of fail mail, fan mail did provide fans with more room to write their personal stories than Twitter's 140-character limit. In this respect, perhaps fan mail is a more personal medium than Twitter but less interactive. There is increased interaction on Twitter partly because the messages exchanged via this platform are much shorter than those exchanged via fan mail. Thus, the main technical differences between Twitter and fan mail - the increased convenience and speed of the former– appear to enable increased interactivity. This being said though; it is difficult to understand whether these short frequent interactions on Twitter mean as much to fans as responses from celebrities via fan mail.

Although social media have taken over many of the functions of fan mail, this does not necessarily mean that in-person interactions between celebrities and fans (e.g. at a concert) have also changed. Scholarly interpretations of fans have shifted considerably, but the manner in which fans actually interact with celebrities in-person has not changed substantially. Thus, perhaps it is just mediated communication between celebrities and fans that has changed. Maybe the desires of fans have always been the same, i.e. to form personal connections, to influence content, to interact, and to participate. Twitter allows fans to fulfill these desires much more easily and frequently and allows for more responses from celebrities due to the conveniences

offered by the medium. Therefore, the motivations underlying fans and celebrities may have remained more or less the same with the shift to social media, rather their resources have changed which allow them to interact differently than before. Fans and celebrities now have access to tools that allow interactions and relationships to grow into something that was at one point unimaginable. This may change fans' expectations of celebrities, as they expect them to respond because it is much easier to now. Furthermore, this kind of interaction may have greater value for celebrities than responding to fan mail because it can be used to build up credibility in front of a large Twitter audience. It is difficult to understand the underlying interpretations and expectations of both fans and celebrities when using Twitter, however what can be understood is that Twitter is allowing for new and improved celebrity-fan interactions and relationships to develop.

Conclusion

The main findings of this MRP are that two-way interactions between celebrities and fans occur more frequently on Twitter than do one-way interactions. In this respect, Twitter is allowing celebrity-fan interactions to become more reciprocal, meaningful and intimate. *Personal connection* was the most prevalent of the categories analyzed, which suggested that bands/artists are able to address fans more directly and discuss matters unrelated to their business. In this way, Twitter has allowed more personal connections to be formed between celebrities and fans. In addition to the development of personal connections, bands also used Twitter to self-promote and share information regarding themselves. This shows that although Twitter allows for more personal connections to be formed, it is also used by bands for their own benefit. However, the frequent combination of *personal connection* and *self-promotion* shows that Twitter allows self-promotion to be more subtle. Furthermore, although Twitter did allow

emotional connections to be formed, these were rather brief and may appear to lack sincerity compared with earlier forms of letter writing. This shows that perhaps Twitter's 140-character limit restricts how deep the connections formed between celebrities and fans can be.

Despite these emotional connections being rather brief, Twitter was successful at allowing fans to collaborate and participate substantially by sharing content and participating in contests. Even though fans were contributing and participating more, collaboration and convergence were often used by bands/artists for their benefit. While the intentions of bands who encourage this kind of participation remains unclear, my analysis suggests that Twitter allows fans not only to consume content, but also to produce it. These results illustrate that Twitter was beneficial for both fans and bands/artists in a number of ways. However, certain categories in my coding scheme were not as prevalent as anticipated on Twitter. The companionship category only appeared twice, showing that perhaps the character limit of Twitter makes it difficult to form genuine friendships on the platform. Similarly, the *persuasiveness* category did not appear at all in the sample which suggests that perhaps bands are not exercising as much power and control over fans as early scholarly literature would suggest.

These results demonstrate a number of patterns across the three bands/artists, however there were variations between bands/artists in their use of Twitter. Bands and artists decide how and when to use Twitter to interact with fans, which may be one way the industry still exercises some power over fans. Although my analysis showed that artists rarely attempt to persuade fans on Twitter and that the platform provides fans with opportunities to interact and connect with celebrities more frequently, celebrities were still in control of what they responded to. The bands/artists analyzed often responded to fans in waves— with a lot of responses one day and none the next. Despite this control, fans often started these conversations which diverges from

traditional interpretations of celebrity-fan interactions that saw fans as passive recipients of broadcasted messages.

This study is significant because it shows that traditional interpretations of celebrity-fan interactions and relationships may in fact be changing. Scholarly literature has only just begun to explore the role of social media in celebrity-fan interactions. My research, then, is important because it begins to expand this exploration into the role of social media in celebrity-fan interactions. It moves toward a better understanding of how bands are using Twitter and its interactive features to form personal connections with fans and market themselves. Furthermore, in identifying these new ways that celebrities and fans are interacting, my study suggests that characteristics of fandom more broadly may be changing in part because social media offers increased engagement, feedback, and interactivity. By sharing personal information about themselves and forming personal connections with fans, bands and artists are able to use Twitter to present and control an image of themselves. This image can be used by bands and artists to market themselves and grow their personal brand. Thus, a well thought out Twitter approach that attempts to make personal connections with fans while also promoting themselves can be very useful for bands and artists.

Traditional interpretations of fans as passive consumers no longer reflect the reality. Rather, social media allow fans to participate and become co-creators of content. Because this research tests traditional interpretations of celebrity-fan interactions and allows for a deeper exploration of the participatory nature of social media, the study contributes valuable insights into a constantly changing industry. With more resources, this study could be expanded to speak directly with bands/artists and fans to better understand their underlying motives and desires when using Twitter. However, at this time this line of research is valuable in showing that

traditional interpretations of fandom and celebrity-fan interactions are changing and that social

media are contributing to those changes.

References

Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International journal of social research methodology*, 8(1), 19-32.

Ballantine, P.W., & Martin, B.A. (2005). Forming parasocial relationships in online communities. *Advances in Consumer Research Volume 32*.

Baym, N.K. (1999). *Tune in, log on: Soaps, fandom and online community* (Vol. 3). Sage Publications.

Booth, P. (2015). *Playing fans: Negotiating fandom and media in the digital age*. University of Iowa Press.

Burgess, J., & Green, J. (2013).*YouTube: Online video and participatory culture.* John Wiley & Sons.

Cohen, J. (1999). Favorite characters of teenage viewers of Israeli serials. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 43, 327–345.

Conway, J. C., & Rubin, A. M. (1991). Psychological predictors of television viewing motivation. *Communication Research, 18*, 443–463.

Deller, R. (2011). Twittering on: Audience research and participation using Twitter. *Participations*, 8(1), 216-245.

Duffet, M. (2014). *Popular music fandom: Identities, roles and practices*. Routledge.

Fiske, J. (1992). The cultural economy of fandom.*The adoring audience: Fan culture and popular media*, 30-49.

Galuszka, P. (2015). New economy of fandom. *Popular Music and Society, 38*(1), 25-43. dii: 10.1080/03007766.2014.97325

Giles, D.C. (2002). Parasocial interaction: A review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media psychology, 4*(3), 279-305.

Gleich, U. (1997). Parasocial interaction with people on the screen. In P. Winterhoff-Spurk & T.H. A. Van der Voort (Eds.). *New horizons in media psychology: Research co-operation and projects in Europe* (pp. 35–55). Opladen, Germany: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Gracyk, T. A. (1992). Adorno, jazz, and the aesthetics of popular music. *The Musical Quarterly*, 76(4), 526-542.

Horton, D., & Strauss, A. (1957). Interaction in audience-participation shows. *American Journal of Sociology*, 62, 579–587.

Jenkins, H. (2003). Quentin Tarantino's Star Wars?: Digital cinema, media convergence, and participatory culture. *Rethinking media change: The aesthetics of transition,* 281-312.

Jenson, J. (1992). Fandom as pathology: The consequences of characterization. The adoring audience: *Fan culture and popular media*, 9-29.

Levy, M. R. (1979). Watching TV news as para-social interaction. *Journal of Broadcasting, 23*, 69–80.

Lewis, L. A. (1992). *The adoring audience: Fan culture and popular media*. Psychology Press.

McQuail, D., Blumler, J. G., & Brown, J. R. (1972). The television audience: A revised perspective. *Media studies: A reader*, 271, 284.

Morley, D. (1993). Active audience theory: Pendulums and pitfalls. J*ournal of communication*, 43(4),13-19.

Rosengren, K. E., & Windahl, S. (1972). Mass media consumption as a functional alternative. In D. McQuail (Ed.), *Sociology of mass communications: Selected readings* (pp. 119–134). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Powell, R.A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction, and local television news viewing. *Human Communication Research*, 12, 155–80.

Rubin, R. B., & McHugh, M. (1987). Development of parasocial interaction relationships. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 31, 279–292.

Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987). Audience activity and soap opera involvement: A uses and effects investigation. *Human Communication Research*, 14, 246–268.

Shapiro, M. (2010). *Justin Bieber: The Fever!*. Macmillan.

Simmons, C. (2009). Dear radio broadcaster: fan mail as a form of perceived interactivity. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *53*(3), 444-459.

Thorson, K. S., & Rodgers, S. (2006). Relationships between blogs as eWOM and interactivity, perceived interactivity, and parasocial interaction. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 6(2), 5-44.

Appendix A: Code Book

Category:	Definition:	Example:
two-sided	Refers to reciprocal interactions between fans and celebrities, whereby the celebrity/artist responds to the tweet(s) of fans.	@madolynmanack: @arkellsmusic oh my god I wanted to see y'all but I had no clue response: @arkellsmusic: when can ya make it to Cleveland heights?!!!
Sub-categories:		@audrhi: @BANNERSMUSIC Where in Canada are you right now? Besides playing nonstop on my iPhone…
one-to-one	Refers to reciprocal interactions where the band directly addresses and communicates with an individual fan.	response: @BANNERSMUSIC: @audrhi Toronto!
one-to-many	Refers to reciprocal interactions where the band is directly addressing fans, but may be responding to, or communicating with, a larger audience.	@dullahannah: HOLY SHIT I'VE BEEN TRYING TO SEE @arkellsmuisc for SO LONG AND NOW THEY'RE COMING TO @Queencityex ☹☹ I'm having a mini freak out at work response: @arkellsmusic: We missed ya Regina!
one-sided	Involves tweets and retweets that are exclusively one-sided as there are no interactions occurring. These are often broadcasted messages from the band to the audience at large. They are initiated by the artist and sent out on their own accord- not replying to fans or communicating directly to them.	@arkellsmusic: Hey y'all - our showcase at Mckiedees is still on! Get on over and we'll start playing when the storm is through

Category:	Definition:	Example:
personal-connection"	Tweets that are of the personal nature, referring to individual fan characteristics and events, usually independent of band-related topics. Reflected through bands using the names of fans, or informally addressing them directly.	@arkellsmusic: @laurendorphin @bayracerun eh - Kampai. Good luck tomorrow!
self-promotion/use	Refers to tweets from bands that pertain to the business ventures of the band and their agenda. |t Involves instances where the band refers to themselves (i.e "we", "us) and tries to promote something relating to their business agenda.	@arkellsmusic: DC! Back in town tonight at @BlackCatDC with @DREAMERSjoinus & @TheKarmaKillers. We play at 8:30! Tix avail: http://arkells.ca/live
Sub-category: informational	When tweets are simply informational, and do not necessarily try to promote.	@chelseamccree: I forgot @arkellsmusic we're going to be in Cleveland and now I'm stuck working until 9 :(:(@arkellsmusic: @chelseamccree We play at 9:15, but will wait until you're through the door
emotional connection	Involves tweets where sentiments and feelings are expressed (e.g. love, like, awesome, great). May also involve the use of emoticons.	@musehysteria27: Nice meeting you, Max @arkellsmusic! Yours is by far the best love letter I've ever received. @arkellsmusic: @musehysteria27 😘😘😘
companionship	Involves feelings of intimacy at a distance, whereby the fans and artists have developed friendships. Indicated by sense of closeness and feelings of togetherness. May also refer to actual in-person interactions.	Dear @arkellsmusic can I get a repeat of this pic tonight except, you know, without that kid in the background? Response: @arkellsmusic:@kara_smiles U got a deal

Category:	Definition:	Example:
Persuasiveness	Involves bands using the interactivity of twitter to persuade and influence fans to engage with their band on various business levels.	@jvmexvii: super pissed i'm missing dreamers, arkells, and the karma killers tonight :(@arkellsmusic: @jvmexvii why? @jvmexvii: @arkellsmusic I have to work @arkellsmusic: @jvmexvii: nah f that. Come, we play at 10.
Collaboration/participation/convergence	Refers to tweets and interactions on twitter whereby the artists/band and the fans are collaborating on content. This may either involve the artist/band asking for collaboration and participation, or fans presenting content to the artist/band.	@StepehnGris: Hey @arkellsmusic- I cut your @885KCSN sesh into tracks & normalized audio. Would love to share, but don't want to step on toes- thoughts? Response: @arkellsmusic: @StephenGris ha! Send to us first? Arkellsmusic @ gmail

Appendix B- Twitter data

The below tweets are those that were analyzed for this sample, including the coding applied with the associated category colours. The results were generated from these findings.

Arkells:

Tweet 1: (June 11)
@arkellsmusic: Arkells + The Bonnaroo Spirit Dancers. Together at last. (with photo of what seems like fans dancing with them)

Tweet 2: (June 10)
@bethany6788: @arkellsmusic can you please come to Detroit soon? <3
@arkellsmusic: Working on it with @TheOfficial89X- promise.

Tweet 3: (June 9) retweet
@EtienneLe5: @arkellsmusic honoured to be accepted! #privateschool #toiletselfie

Tweet 4: (June 9)
@arkellsmusic: Lotsa perks for ACVO kids & here's one! Post yer Student ID if ya live in GTA & wanna hang Monday at a house show.

Tweet 5: (June 9)
@arkellsmusic: Would like to send a big thank you to @SmokesIndoors- a local by' petitioning to bring us to @GeorgeStLive. Tix on us. You rule. Party!

Tweet 6: (June 8)
@stalchys: @1027KIISFM play this song of the summer "Private School" by @arkellsmusic #2016summerjams
@arkellsmusic: @stalchys @1027KIISFM now this would be special.

Tweet 7: (June 8)
@arkellsmusic: Mike vs 'MURICA (with picture of Mike)

Tweet 8: (June 8)- retweet
@elizabethlehem: Just (legally) downloaded Arkells entire discography because I honestly don't know what I was doing with my life before it. @arkellsmusic

Tweet 9: (June 7)
@arkellsmusic: Dear @SongExploder- your pod case is the best music podcast. Thanks for keeping us company on long drives.

Tweet 10: (June 7)
@marin_hudson: Hey @arkellsmusic! I enrolled in school a ways back and fear I may have been rejected! Wazzup with that?
@arkellsmusic: @marin_hudson mmmm @umisc ?

@umusic: @arkellsmusic @marin_hudson Looking into this for you!!
@umusic: @arkellsmusic @marin_hudson Had a look & you're 100% in the system. Your package will be mailed out this week! Keep an eye on your mailbox :)
@marin_hudson: @umusic @arkellsmusic thank you both! :)

Tweet 11: (June 6)
@Tdubs35: @arkellsmusic will this get me backstage at your set for @LiveAtFirefly and a possible meet and greet ;)
@arkellsmusic: Maybe.

Tweet 12: (June 6)
@whitexsparrows: @arkellsmusic can the next cool new tour date you announce be for Detroit please I miss you guys
@arkellsmusic: Watchya got cooking @TheOfficial89X / @Cagno?

Tweet 13: (June 6) retweet
@TimSchara: @arkellsmusic Bloodlines episode 18…..A Little Rain playing in the bar scene??!!!

Tweet 14: (June 5)
@StephenGris: Hey @arkellsmusic- I cut your @885KCSN sesh into tracks & normalized audio. Would love to share, but don't want to step on toes- thoughts?
@arkellsmusic: @StephenGris ha! Send to us first! Arkellsmusic @ gmail
@StephenGris: can do

Tweet 15: (June 4)
@arkellsmusic: Beautiful night in #HamOnt- thanks to everyone involved with #WelcomeToHamilton for making the evening so special.

Tweet 16: (June 3)- complete with video featuring their new single private school
@arkellsmusic: Let's go @BlueJays!!! This feels niiiiiice.   CC: @Sportsnet

Tweet 17: (June 3)
@arkellsmusic: Working out the vibe for tonight. (complete with picture of band member sitting beside piano on piano bench playing the guitar)

Tweet 18: (June 2)
@AndreaaNWR: @arkellsmusic is kayaking offered as a sport at the Arkells Collegiate Vocational Institute? (complete with picture of her in kayak)
@arkellsmusic: @AndreaaNWR yes!

Tweet 19: (June 2)- retweet
@MDMusicLog: Check out "A Little Rain (A Song For Pete," the new tune from Arkells: (complete with link to song)

Tweet 20: (June 1)
@TheVertical: Golden State GM Bob Myers goes deep inside Warriors with @WojVerticalNBA on @TheVertical podcast. Listen/Subscribe: (with link)
@arkellsmusic: Very awesome podcast.

Tweet 21: (June 1)
@JamiePresement: @arkellsmusic is this a coincidence or does Anthony have one shirt? (with picture)
@arkellsmusic: HmmHm @Anthony_Carone?

Tweet 22: (June 1)- retweet
@PhillyPartTwo: Hey @Radio1045: I keep tuning in hoping to hear @ArkellsMusic's 'Private School', but haven't caught it…when can I hear it next? #arkells

Tweet 23: (June 1)- retweet
@NikkiIrvine: Just hittin' zinger after zinger with these new tracks, @arkellsmuisc👌 can't wait for the live performances of these! #alittlerain

Tweet 24: (June 1)
@arkellsmusic: Ppl, we got something for ya…right now.

Tweet 25: (May 31)- retweet
@lauren_carson: when i think about the @arkellsmusic concert last night my heart fills with so much joy that i think i might eventually explode

Tweet 26: (May 31)
@arkellsmusic: Dancing to a little soil music can make everything a little better. Set list - Commonwealth Bar. Calgary, May 30/16

Tweet 27: (May 31)
@TheSifuAbides: Went to see @arkellsmusic yesterday, and I realized why they happen to be so popular…they're really good looking guys with great songs!
@arkellsmusic: @TheSifuAbides ha! Thanks:)

Tweet 28: (May 30)
@siomo: Passed guy in Private School T while Private School was on the radio @arkellsmusic
@arkellsmusic: This is the greatest.

Tweet 29: (May 30)
@Disasta_masta: .@arkellsmusic since you guys are gonna be in town beginning of September please @UAlberta have them perform for week of welcome
@arkellsmusic: @Disasta_masta @UAlberta we could get down with this.

Tweet 30: (May 30)
@mmxniall: @arkellsmusic AHHH YOURE COMING TO CALGARY
@arkellsmusic:<3<3<3

Tweet 31: (May 28)
@_NotBatman: Does this mean I can drop out of university? #arkellsprivateschool @arkellsmusic (with picture of private school student card and letter)
@arkellsmusic: Yes.

Tweet 32: (May 28) retweet
@SmokesIndoors: So help me god if you didn't phone arkells about this years festival i'll go all Homer Simpson hunger strike on you! :@GeorgeStLive: Announcement could happen this week. Follow us here & at http://www.facebook.com/GeorgeStLive to be among the 1st to find out.

Tweet 33: (May 27)
@dullahannah: HOLY SHIT I'VE BEEN TRYING TO SEE @arkellsmuisic FOR SO LONG AND NOW THEY'RE COMING TO @Queencityex 😞😞 I'm having a mini freak out at work
@arkellsmusic: We missed ya Regina!

Tweet 34: (May 26)
@jenna_marie12: Just found out MY FAVOURITE FUCKING BAND EVER is playing in my city RIGHT AFTER THEIR ALBUM RELEASE @arkellsmuisc FUCKING PUMPED
@arkellsmusic: @jenna_marie12 which city

Tweet 35: (May 26)
@Renee_mariee: I love Arkells so much please come back to Edmonton @arkellsmusic
@arkellsmusic: Hmmm what do you say @sonic1029 ?

Tweet 36: (May 24)
@MitchellTrainor: Hey @arkellsmusic, currently touring and need a cheap veggy dinner in Hamilton. Where should we go?
@arkellsmusic: .@DemocracyCoffee / @WORKfood has nice options.

Tweet 37: (May 23)
@arkellsmusic: When everyone is talking about the new Game of Thrones and you haven't seen it yet

Tweet 38: (May 22)
@arkellsmusic: Al <3 <3 <3 to Kesha. Also all praise Ben Folds (most underrated songwriter of the past 20 years?).
@fattycollins: @arkellsmusic Jackson cannery/zak and Sara/bastard/draw a crowd/ still fighting it/battle of who would care less/ kate…amazing writer
@arkellsmusic: @fattycollins Jackson cannery made me go wild

Tweet 39: (may 22)
@snookoholic: I'm kind of offended that @arkellsmusic has never tweeted me back. I love you guys, ok? Just let it happen.
@arkellsmusic: @snookoholic ❤

Tweet 40: (May 21)

@BeaterOfDrums: @arkellsmusic on HNIC montage…...what a pleasant surprise! 😌😍
@arkellsmusic: 🙌 @hockeynight

Banners:
Tweet 1: (June 14th)
@poppedmusic: @bannersmusic @haarmband AHEM! That's our sweeps team you're slagging off you two naughty scamps #blogsvbands #euro2016
@bannersmusic: @poppedmusic @harmband woah woah woah. We're bigging them up if anything!

Tweet 2: (June 13)
@buscarnos: @bannersmusic when is your birthday? 🙈.
@bannersmusic: @buscarnos July 12th 😎

Tweet 3: (June 12)
@sebellmusic: @bannersmusic sleep is for the weak!
@bannersmusic: Think you've got that a bit wrong mate. Sleep is for the tired. Not lifting heavy things is for the weak…

Tweet 4: (June 11)
@bannersmusic: Who'd win in a fight? All the people in The Hunger Games or all the people in Battle Royale? #HungerGames vs #battleroyale
@riarklerise: @bannersmusic i think hunger games
@bannersmusic: @riarklerise just because of j-law?

Tweet 5: (June 11)
@audrhi: @bannersmusic Where in Canada are you right now? Besides playing nonstop on my iPhone…
@bannersmusic: @audrhi Toronto!
@audrhi: @bannersmusic Come to the baseball tomorrow. I'll leave you tix.
@bannersmusic: @audrhi aw that's really lovely of you, I can't tomorrow, im out of town, but thankyou! 😎

Tweet 6: (June 10)
@thaisddomingues: @Bannersmusic Michael, would you like to come to Brazil?
@bannersmusic: @thaisddomingues very much!

Tweet 7: (June 9)
@poppedmusic: @bannersmusic is that you in? if so will be having someone pick everyone's team ahead of opening game tomorrow! ⚽
@bannersmusic: @poppedmusic absolutely! What do I need to do? Anyone but england please!
@poppedmusic: @bannersmusic nothing - we all just get a team to "follow" "support" so we can fling insults at each other on Twitter during the euros 😆
@bannersmusic: @poppedmusic finally! An excuse to fling insults. That's all I need to hear!

Tweet 8: (June 8)
@bannersmusic: "Half Light" is on @HypeMachine! Lend a little ❤
http://hypem.com/track/2gyyf/BANNERS+-+Half+Light …

Tweet 9: (June 7)
@bannersmusic: Just been to bulk barn and my total came to $6.66. who knew the combo of snacks and coconut water was evil?! (with picture of receipt included)

Tweet 10: (June 6)
@SzlafarskiMusic: @bannersmusic my 7 year old piano student wants to know where the name BANNERS comes from
@bannersmusic: I guess a Banner is something you go to battle behind. The colours identify you, like your music! It's a bit LFC too!

Tweet 11: (June 5)
@shennars: Copenhagen, city of dreams
@bannermusic: @shenners go 'ed Copenhagen!

Tweet 12: (June 3)
@JhonxAraujo: @bannersmusic I'm from Brazil and I'm going to Osheaga to see your concert! ❤ I love you! 🎉🙌
@bannersmusic: Wow! See you there!

Tweet 13: (June 3)
@bannersmusic: You've all bullied into this! Happy now?! 😉

Tweet 14: (May 27)
@bannersmusic: How's everyone doing? I'm on a train and noticed I need shoes. The absolute state of those laces! (with picture of shoes)

Tweet 15: (May 26)
@chessie__: @bannersmusic Can I get one of those T-shirts?
@bannersmusic: @chessie__ I don't have any left! I'm sorry. I'll order some more!

Tweet 16: (May 20)
@BANNERSMUSIC: stuck in loads of traffic so had to invent baseball game involving coin flips. Just lost 12-8. Hard to take… (image of him playing game included)

Tweet 17: (May 17)
@bannersmusic: Ever wondered what I look like when I'm singing? It looks well like this, apparently… (with image)

Tweet 18: (May 16)
@poppedmusic: @bannersmusic and when are we hanging out?
@bannersmusic: I'm playing on Saturday. You coming?

Tweet 19: (May 15)
@onedlovatox: @bannersmusic I was so sad today and I went to listen your music. Thanks, I am so better, thanks, BANNERS! <3
@bannersmusic: I'm glad it helps! ☺

Tweet 20: (May 13)
@bannersmusic: Hanging with @johngibbonsblog and @stevehothersall at the top of the tower. Get on the view! #Liverpool #radiocity (with image)

Tweet 21: (May 10)
@falloutboners: @BANNERSMUSIC what time does the concert end on the 21st of May in Liverpool?
@bannersmusic: @falloutboners I'm not sure! You coming?
@falloutboners: @bannersmusic I really want to! It's just so far away, are you doing any other small venues this year?
@bannersmusic: @falloutboners probably! :)

Tweet 22: (may 9)
@thetanbutterfly: @bannersmusic HI I absolutely love your music! When will Half Light be available on iTunes? xx (Such a huge fan btw💜💜💜💜)
@bannersmusic: @thetanbutterfly soon I hope! :)

Tweet 23: (may 7)
@bannersmusic: That sigh at the start of Hallelujah by Jeff Buckley…

Tweet 24: (May 3)- conversation following up a tweet he sent out about him at a blue jays game (complete with image) -retweet reply thingy
@emeryxs: @bannersmusic better than soccer?
@bannersmusic: Let's not be silly about this!

Tweet 25: (May 2)
@chessie__: @bannersmusic What are you doing?
@bannersmusic: I'm considering going for a run…considering is the key word here. How about you?

Tweet 26: (May 1)
@fairlylocaljp: @bannersmusic how many new songs did you already record? and how's your day been so far :D
@bannersmusic: 3 new guys. Just waiting for @IslandRecords to tell me they're rubbish…

Tweet 27: (April 30)
@bannersmusic: Getting my record on. New songs! Woo!

Tweet 28: (April 29)
@BANNERSMUSIC: Why are there so many places in Canada and the US with the same name as English places? How many Grimsbys do we need in the world?

Tweet 29: (April 26)
@bannersmusic: Check out more from my hang with @Gap down in Austin. So much denim. #nothingbutdenim #ad http://bit.ly/233X8Qk (with image attached of him)

Tweet 30: (April 24)
@lomlosophiabush: how many retweets to I have to get for you to release "half light"? @BANNERSMUSIC
@bannersmusic: Haha! That song was lost In a fire and there was only one copy sadly…such a shame. :(

Tweet 31: (April 21)
@bannersmusic: Good morning everyone. How's it goin?

Tweet 32: (April 19)
@SarahKennett95: @bannersmusic when are you releasing half light?
@bannersmusic: Oh man…im not sure. do you think I should?

Tweet 33: (April 19)
@sebellmusic: @bannersmsuic Sry but stole it when you went to grab an iced latte. Sold it to @jamieoliver. Watch for it in his next cookbook. :P
@banners: I knew something was up! You've got some nerve.

Tweet 34: (April 17)
@bannersmusic: Sunshine! Finally! Celebrating with moon safari by @airofficial #sexyboy #moonsafari (with picture of cityscape)

Tweet 35: (April 16)
@tamarratown: lol apparently when you go to sleep thinking about @wayhomefestibal you dream about prepping @BANNERSMUSIC for his performance #lifecoach
@bannersmusic: Wow! Any words of advice?

Tweet 36: (April 14)
@benh262: @bannersmusic lad….lad…..lad!!!…lad I can't even…iv missed this feeling hahah
@bannersmusic: Unbelievable mate!!!!

Tweet 37: (April 12)
@T3CHK1DD: @bannersmusic are you coming to Cleveland, Ohio at some point in the future?
@bannersmusic: Yep, on July 21st! :)

Tweet 38: (April 11)
@gwenstahcy: @bannersmusic cover stairway on your next us tour? :P
@bannersmusic: I could never do it justice!!

Tweet 39: (April 10)

@Oh_Honey_Lovers: When @BANNERSMUSIC plays on the radio while you're doing school work (snapchat video of her attached with dog filter dancing to banners song)
@bannersmusic: That happens!?! If I'd have known my song was doing that to people I'd never have released it! I'm sorry everyone…

Tweet 40: (april 4)
@emilyjv: @bannersmusic I made it onto @spotify!! You've been my inspiration in this journey with *your* EP, so high five!! :D
@bannersmusic: @emilyjv @Spotify 👍 congratulations!
@emilyjv: @bannersmusic @Spotify :D Thanks!! So exciting. How did you feel??
@bannersmusic: @emilyjv it's super exciting sharing your music with people. Especially when you're proud of it! How about you? **keeping the conversation going- not sure it's collaboration though
@emlyjv: @bannersmusic after like 10 yrs being too scared and still having anxiety issues to see your dream kinda materializing is just overwhelming! (banners liked this last tweet)

Rachel Platten:

Tweet 1: (June 12)
@ladycalilumina: @RachelPlatten A friend had issues with @AmericanAir, and @DeltaAssit was able to help them & get them to their destination in time
@rachelplatten: @ladycalilumina @AmericanAir @DeltaAssist that's a good idea!!

Tweet 2: (June 12)
@racheplatten: 2 hour delay and no apologies or explanation other than "we just can't find her". Not terribly impressed @AmericanAir

Tweet 3: (June 11)
@AlexisBergasse: Thank you @RachelPlatten for sharing yours and @TheRealGrimmie's talents with us <3 #RIPChristina (with video of rachel singing attached)

Tweet 4: (June 11)
@rachelplatten: I am in tears and absolutely shocked. We spent an amazing month on tour with her & she radiates nothing but love. So sad. #PrayForChristina

Tweet 5: (June 10)
@rachelplatten: Life is tough but my darling SO ARE YOU.

Tweet 6: (June 9)
@rachelplatten: ✈️ -> NYC to sing at the Songwriter Hall of Fame induction ceremony. Fangirl time: I'm so excited to meet you @tompetty - I'm a huge fan.

Tweet 7: (June 7)
@rachelplatten: RachelPlatts Q&A! Tweet me questions w/ the hashtag #RachelPlattsSnaps! I'll be answering on @Snapchat tomorrow 12:30 PM PST!

Tweet 8: (June 3)
@amandamerr16: @rachelplatten chocolate comes from trees, so chocolate is salad. #nocalories
@racheplatten: Wow. Amanda for president.

Tweet 9: (June 3)
@AdamReisinger: @rachelplatten that reminds me, food on airplanes doesn't count
@racheplatten: Yep. That's right Adam! You're suspended in air and may never land so again this is very important

Tweet 10: (June 3)
@irwinsnourry: @rachelplatten leftovers aren't as many calories the first time eaten
@rachelplatten: @irwinsnourry excellent point

Tweet 11: (June 3)
@Linda_Pizutti: Luminous performance by Boston-native @RachelPlatten at tonight's @UNICEG gala #FightSong #childrenfirst
@rachelplatten: thank you so much. It was such an honour!

Tweet 12: (June 1)
@RachelPlatten: It was such a pleasure having Priscilla & Daniel in my #BetterPlace video ❤ 👫 http://rachelplatten.com/betterplacestoryboard …(with image of them attached)

Tweet 13: (May 27)
@RachelPlatten: I'm so excited to share #BetterPlace video stories. Here's how Bryce & Chris make each other's 🌎 a #BetterPlace. (with Tumblr link)

Tweet 14: (May 24)
@devynx421: @rachelplatten I thought you'd like to know that my little sister picked fight song as one of her audition songs😁 (attached video of sister practicing song)
@rachelplatten: @devynx421 YES DEV.

Tweet 15: (May 24)
@chrisleonis: @rachelplatten that's why I deactivated my fb account..I get absolutely nothing one with my songwriting. depressing…too much informations
@rachelplatten: @chrisleonis yes! I love a book called #theartistway that recommends a cleanse from all information for 10 days for any create blocks.

Tweet 16: (May 24)
@swiftiestevie13: @rachelplatten if you can write beautiful songs you can write a speech for you sister!! Good luck. You sis makes you 🌎 a better place
@rachelplatten: @swiftiestevie13 I knowwwwww. It's harder than songs though :(

Tweet 17: (May 24
@lauramarano: Literally so emotional after watching Game of Thrones…I'm a wreck
@rachelplatten: @lauramarano hodorrrr :(((

Tweet 18: (May 23)
@rachelplatten: These ladies killed it tonight 🙌🙌🙌🙌 @FifthHarmony

Tweet 19: (May20)
@rachelplatten: Thank you @myangelrplatten and everyone that sent videos in - it brought tears to my eyes. I feel so lucky and full of love for you all.😍😍😍😍

Tweet 20: (May 18)
@rachelplatten: Follow spree today!! Tag someone who makes your 🌎 a #BetterPlace & I'll follow you both back!!

Tweet 21: (May 14)
@rachelplatten: Thanks @tokyoextra for hanging out and introducing me to yaki-niku 😍. MISS YOU JAPAN!!

Tweet 22: (may 12)
@rachelplatten: You're a pretty amazing sister Katherine! Ethan is lucky to have you! 👱🙍💁😎 #BetterPlace

Tweet 23: (may 10)- retweet
@bmi: #FightSong singer @RachelPlatten says to NEVER doubt yourself as a songwriter. #BMIPopAwards (with link to image of rachel)

Tweet 24: (may 10)
@nashvilleswifft: @RachelPlatten my dog is obsessed with better place❤ (video attached)
@rachelplatten: really not a great day for me verse dogs. Example #2 this dog clearly kicking my ass at singing my own song.

Tweet 25: (may 9)- retweet
@fusetv: .@RachelPlatten drops her most heartwarming video yet #BetterPlace http://on.fuse.tv/1Zxasf7

Tweet 26: (May 8)
@halaarkoub BETTER PLACE VIDEO TOMORROW OMG @RachelPlatten
@rachelplatten: True.

Tweet 27: (May 5)
@sweetbriaredu: Can't wait to welcome @RachelPlatten to #SweetBriar this Saturday for #CheggMusic101! Thank you for making it all happen, @Chegg!
@rachelplatten: @sweetbriaredu @chegg so excited guys!

Tweet 28: (May 5)
@rachelplatten: I've always wanted to be in a killer flash mob. Thanks for letting my song #standbyyou be in yours @nbcheartbeat 🙌 (with link to a gif of it from the show)

Tweet 29: (May 2)
@rachelplatten: About to go live on @Beats1 x @AppleMusic w/ @WestSideGyrl Use #Beats1Request & tune in! http://apple.co/Beats1

Tweet 30: (April 30)
@stylehaulsteph: Congrats to our fellow @trinitycollege grad @RachelPlatten on her #DaytimeEmmys win!!! From me @Goldwizzle & @TracyCrane5 🎉
@rachelplatten: @stylehaulsteph @trinitycollege @Goldwizzle @TracyCrane5 aw thanks girls!

Tweet 31: (April 29)
@itsblondeswift: @RachelPlatten #BetterPlace my best friend makes my world a better place 💕
(wth image attached of her and her best friend)
@rachelplatten: Love love LOVE this pic!! Your friendship makes MY 🌍 a #BetterPlace.

Tweet 32: (April 25)- retweet
@TheGRAMMYMuseum: Do you <3 #FightSong? We do! Don't miss @RachelPlatten on May 9 in our Clive Davis Theater! http://www.grammymuseum.org/events/detail/rachel-platten …

Tweet 33: (April 25)
@rachelplatten: Brooke, thank you. I feel lucky to have this song be a part of you and your baby's lives in such a meaningful way.

Tweet 34: (April 21)
@ava_lemon7: @rachelplatten we made a musical.ly for better place! Do you like it? (with video attached)
@rachelplatten: @ava_lemon7 I totally love it.

Tweet 35: (April 19)
@rachelplatten: Amsterdam 😍 (with picture attached)

Tweet 36: (April 15)
@phrachelplatten: Hello @RachelPlatten! We made something for you & Nana Platten. Please watch this little video from your Plattenums. (with video attached)
@rachelplatten: @phrachelplatten this just made me tear up. You guys are the SWEETEST

Tweet 37: (April 13)- retweet
@idolator: .@RachelPlatten tells us how her life has changed since "Fight Song" exploded: http://idola.to/1Vpg6SD

Tweet 38: (April 12)
@rachelplatten: Who makes your world a better place? Tag your pic with #BetterPlace and I'll share it! Here's one of my better places (picture of her and her Grandma attached)

Tweet 39: (April 9)
@hcurriebeauty: @rachelplatten so much love to feel! <3
@rachelplatten: @hcurriebeauty awwww hi babe!!!

Tweet 40: (April 7)

@apdimas2: @RachelPlatten Do you have the authority to allow my 8 year old son battling cancer attend your concert tomorrow in Albuquerque?

@rachelplatten: @apdimas2 I'll try! @ClaireSSavage can you check if we can make an exception?

Appendix C- Twitter Results

	Arkells:	Banners:	Rachel Platten:	Total:
Two-sided:	19	30	20	69
One-to-one:	9	15	12	36
One-to-many:	10	16	7	33
One-sided:	19	13	21	53
Personal-connection:	24	38	28	90
Self-promotion/use	14	3	6	23
Informational	4	5	1	10
Emotional-connection	3	6	14	23
Companionship	0	2	0	2
Persuasiveness	0	0	0	0
Collaboration/participation/convergence	5	0	8	13