

Digital Brand Engagement with Data Story Telling

Module guide 2020

Author(s)	Simeona Petkova Bjorn Martin van den Berg
Module ID	8700DB__17
Academic Year	2019-2020
EC	4
Contact hours	80
Self study hours	40
Course site	Digital Brand Engagement

Author(s)	Simeona Petkova Bjorn Martin van den Berg
Module ID	8700DBE__17
Academic Year	2019-2020
EC	6
Contact hours	80
Self study hours	60
Course site	Digital Brand Engagement

Module overview

This guide gives you an overview of the summer course Digital Brand Engagement

Content

Consumers have more control over social media channels than over any other channel which means that brands really need to become more agile with their digital brand engagement practices. However, it is not always clear how customer engagement can be nurtured and measured.

Digital Brand Engagment summer course offers you the opportunity to bring you up to speed with current and relevant academic developments in the field of digital engagement. Through interaction with different subject matter experts you will be approaching the topic of engagement from different angles.

For the duration of two weeks, we will actively and intensively analyse and work with academic and practitioners' considerations regarding engagement on online (social) platforms. For a maximum experience that will lead you to the desired outcomes, we have compiled a reader and designed several assignments (the first one should be prepared upon arrival and finalised during the first two days of the program, while assignment 2 will be completed within the duration of the program).

1.2 Learning goals

	You can:
1.	Explain various theoretical and research frameworks of online brand engagement.
2.	Review various ways of measuring brand engagement.
3.	Create typologies of brand engagement on different social media platforms such as Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube.
4.	Set goals and define online value propositions to engage customers using different digital channels that are aligned with the overall branding strategies.
5.	Evaluate brands' digital marketing strategies and make strategic recommendations to increase engagement
6.	Define approaches to test and optimise brand engagement.
7.	Create and code your online digital engagement research portfolio.

1.3 Learning activities

WEEK 1:

Subject matter experts on several related topics. You get to write a paper on the academic debates and conceptualisations of brand engagement and its practices.

WEEK 2:

Master classes from business practices. You get to work on a group project where you will compare brand customer engagement performances across various channels and make strategic recommendations to improve them. This year's edition of the DBE summer school runs in partnership with MTV (Viacom) and it includes a company visit and projects pitches at the MTV (EMA) headquarters in Amsterdam.

Extended 6 EC version

For students who need 6 EC in order to transfer their course back to their home university we offer an opportunity to acquire an additional 2 ECTS with our special extended version. This means you will attend the two-week course and, after finishing the course and returning home, work on the extra assignment under online guidance of one of our lecturers. You can hand-in your assignment up to 4 weeks after the course ends (by e-mail).

Additional learning activities extended version

Week 3 and 4: Individual work in Amsterdam or at home. You will write a paper on managerial implications across markets and industries with learnings drawn from your literature review and connected to your Summer School MTV research. Furthermore, you are expected to develop and expand your online portfolio that you have coded during the 2 weeks summer school.

1.4 Teaching methods

Reading salon;
In-class discussion;
Experts presentations and interactive sessions;
Project workshops;
Coding (HTML&CSS) and data vizualization sessions;

1.5 Reading materials subjected to change

Brodie, R.J. et al. (2013). Consumer Engagement in a Virtual Brand Community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 105–114. Available via:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com.rps.hva.nl:2048/science/article/pii/S0148296311002657>.

de Vries N.J., Carlson J, Moscato P. (2014). A Data-Driven Approach to Reverse Engineering Customer Engagement Models: Towards functional constructs. *PLoS ONE*, 9 (7).

Kwok, L. and Yu, B. (2012). Messages on Facebook: An Analysis of restaurant business-to-consumer communications. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 20 (10), 1-11.

Waters, R.D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., and Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 102-106. Available via:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com.rps.hva.nl:2048/science/article/pii/S0363811109000046>

Coursaris et al. (2013). A Social Media Marketing Typology: Classifying Brand Facebook Page Messages for Strategic Consumer Engagement. *Proceedings of the 21st European Conference on Information Systems*.

Bechmann, A., Klausen, H.B. (2016). Measuring Impact Across Social Media: An analysis of the digital social layer on Northside festival as a larger cultural event in Aarhus in 2014. *rethinkIMPACTS 2017*.

Hesselberth, P. (2019). Discourses on disconnectivity and the right the disconnect. *New media and Society*, 20 (5), 1994-2010.

“Dear Data” (www.dear-data.com), last accessed 30 May 2019.

* Do use Google Scholar and link the AUAS (Hogeschool van Amsterdam) Library to it to be able to access the academic articles above.

1.6 Assignments&Assessment*

Assignment 1 is to be done upon arrival and finalised during the first two days of the summer program.

Assignment 1 (Individual Assignment):

- Read the articles referenced in the reader. What is the author’s approach towards (online) brand engagement? What theories do they use? What types of methods (of data collection) do they use? What are their findings (are they interesting) and what are the recommendations to the marketing professionals?
- Which brands do you follow online? Which online media channels do you use to engage with those brands? What type of content (brand’s content) do you often like, share, comment and recommend? How would you start investigating how you (as a customer) interact with brands? Try to come up with a coherent (research) analysis.

- Reviewing your own digital brand engagement, how would you relate your research approach to the ways the authors in the reader investigate and conceptualise online brand engagement? How can we study brand engagement? What type of data do we need and what methods do we use to collect and analyse it? What are the opportunities and perils of online brand engagement? What are the points of critique regarding the ways online brand engagement has been studied (seen through the research papers in the reader)? What would you recommend a marketer to do as in how to engage and how not to engage with customers online?
- Provide answers to those questions in a form of an essay of maximum 2000 words. You can use the information and the considerations provided by the guest lecturers as well.

Assignment 2 Types of Online Brand Engagement on Instagram (Group Assignment):

- Step 1: Read closely and analyse your assignment brief (to be introduced by a company's commissioner in week 1).
- Step 2: How do you define engagement? Can you define types of engagement using the literature referenced in the reader. Which KPIs are you going to follow? How are the brands you have chosen engaging with the users of Instagram: via their brand's profiles, via #s, via campaign #s? What content has been shared?
- Step 3: What are you researching? What is your research question (regarding the engagement strategies of the chosen brands). Why is this important / relevant?
- Step 4: Which theories from the reader (knowledge gained from the guest talks) would you use to begin to answer your question(s)? Elaborate on this.
- Step 5: What type of method(s) did you use to capture the data? What type of methods did you use to analyse the data? How can your methods bring inconsistencies (even prejudices) in your data analysis? What are the patterns that you discover? Provide an analysis of your datasets.
- Step 6: Map your findings. Visualise your findings. Code your findings. Try to relate back your findings to the literature review. What recommendations would you suggest to the professionals in the field?
- Prepare an online presentation based on your project to showcase your engagement research and results. The coding classes will help you to publish and share your project online.

Assignment 3 Types of Online Brand Engagement on Instagram (Individual online assignment for 6 ECTs):

- Step 1: Reflect on your Assignments 1 and 2. Think how you can repurpose the analyses for various industries and brands.
- Step 2: Enlarge you online portfolio with additional web features and content.
- Step 3: Send us the URL of your portfolio in due time (before the end of 30th of August 2019).

Assignments / Tests	Weight	Weight (extended)
	(%)	
4 ECTS		
Project	50%	
Individual assignment	50%	
6 ECTS		
Project		50%
Individual assignment		50%
Individual assignment (online assignment)		Pass or fail

*** For the assessment forms of your assignments, please see Appendix 1.**

1.7 Provisional Planning

Digital Brand Engagement Summer School SCHEDULE WEEK 1

Monday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9.00 – 11.00 Official Welcome and Meet&Greet

11.00 – 11.30 Coffee and Tea Break

11.30 - 12.30 DBE meet and greet

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 - 14.30 Subject Matter Expert (TBC)

14:30 - 15:00 Coffee and Tea Break

17:00 - 17.15 Closing Remarks & Social Activities Information

16:00 -17:00 Dutch Culture Workshop (Wibauthuis)

Tuesday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9.00 – 11.00 Reading Salon (part 2)

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee and Tea

11.30 - 12.30 Subject Matter Expert (TBC)

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 - 14.30 Paper writing

14:30 - 15:30 Subject Matter Expert (TBC)

15:30 -16:00 Coffee and Tea Break

17:00 - 17.15 Closing Remarks& Social Activities Information

Wednesday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9:00 – 09.30 Day start

09.30 – 11.00 **Subject Matter Expert (TBC)**

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee and Tea

11.30 - 12.30 Coding made easy – introduction

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 – 14:30 Reading Salon

14:30 – 17:00 Finalising your individual papers

17:00 - 17.15 Closing Remarks& Social Activities Information

Thursday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9.00 – 10.00 Day Start

10:00 - 11.00 Project Pitch by company

11.00 - 12.30 Project Work

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 - 14.30 Project Work

14:30 - 15:30 Coding made easy

15:30 -16:00 Coffee and Tea Break

16:00 - 17:00 Perception and Data Visualisation Session

17:00 - 17.15 Closing Remarks& Social Activities Information

Friday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9.00 – 10.30 Coding made easy and Project work

10.30 – 11:00 Coffee and Tea

11.00 – 12:30 Project Work

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 - 17.00 “Dear Data”and Data Storytelling

17:00 WEEKEND!

Digital Brand Engagement Summer School SCHEDULE WEEK 2

Monday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9.00 – 11.00 Project Work

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee and Tea

11.30 - 12.30 Subject Matter Expert (TBD)

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 - 14.30 Project Work

14:30 - 15:30 Project Work

15:30 -16:00 Coffee and Tea Break

16:00 - 17:00 Coding made easy

17:00 - 17.15 Closing Remarks& Social Activities Information

Tuesday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9:00 – 11.00 Project Work

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee and Tea

11.30 - 12.30 Project Work

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 - 14.30 “Dear Data” and Data Storytelling Session 2 (Radmila Radojevic)

14:30 - 15:30 Coding made easy

15:30 -16:00 Coffee and Tea Break

16:00 - 17:00 Coding made easy and Project Work

17:00 - 17.15 Closing Remarks& Social Activities Information

Wednesday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9.00 – 11.00 Project Work

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee and Tea

11.30 - 12.30 Project Work

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 - 14.30 Data Storytelling Tools

14:30 - 15:30 Coding made easy

15:30 -16:00 Coffee and Tea Break

16:00 - 17:00 Coding made easy

17:00 - 17.15 Closing Remarks& Social Activities Information

Thursday

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH Amsterdam

9.00 – 11.00 Project Work Feedback Session

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee and Tea

11.30 - 12.30 Project Work Finalisation

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

13.30 - 14.30 Project Work Finalisation

14:30 - 15:30 Project Work Presentation

15:30 -16:00 Coffee and Tea Break

16:00 - 17:00 Project Work Presentation

Friday 12 July 2019

Location:

Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Wibauthuis 5th floor, Wibautstraat 3b, 1091 GH
Amsterdam

9.00 – 12.30 Company Visit MTV VIACOM

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch Break

14:30 - 15:30 Summer School Wrap Up and Reflection / Evaluation

15:30 -16:00 Coffee and Tea Break

16:00 - 17:30 Festive Handing out the Diplomas

Appendix 1

Assessment model assignment 1, individual work (40% of the final grade)

Chapters	Criteria	Weight	
Introduction	Assignment background (situation and questions to be answered)	10%	
Body	Theoretical framework Method Analysis Case studies (personal brand engagement reflection)	70%	
Conclusion	Clear recommendations Critical perspective	20%	
Bibliography	APA referencing style Credible sources used (textbooks, business magazines and newspapers e.g. Business Week, Financial Times, Fortune etc)	n/a*	
English	The assignment is written in proper Business English	n/a*	
Layout	Cover page with the group members' names, student numbers, assignment title, class, date, lecturer's name	n/a*	
Total Grade for each assignment		100%	(40 %)

Assessment model assignment 2, Group Presentation

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (< 5.5)	Partially Proficient (5.5 < 6.5)	Proficient (6.5 < 7.5)	Exemplary (≥ 7.5)	Rating
Presentation structure	Poor quality content, hard to read, technically inaccurate, poorly constructed. Poor coordination No or weak focus on important aspects.	The presentation of the content is marginally acceptable, too complex, crowded, and difficult to read or interpret. Showed little understanding of how to write for the Web. Poor focus on important aspects.	Content is usually clear, easy to interpret and easy to read. Generally well-coordinated with the design of the page. Demonstrated some understanding of how to write for the Web. Mostly focused and consistent.	Content is clear, easy to interpret and easy to read. Well-coordinated with the design of the page. Excellent example of how to prepare good content for the Web. Focused but consistent.	20%
Presentation skills	The visuals are used poorly. Presenter did not seem to know how to use them effectively. Poor stage presence. Poor time management, time management did not fit the requirements at large.	The visuals are used insufficiently. Showed little understanding of how to use them. Insufficient stage presence. Acceptable time management (max +/- 25%), weak time balance between sections.	The visuals are generally used effectively. Balance between usage of the visuals to support storytelling and free speech usually good. Sufficient stage presence. Overall good time management (max +/- 10%), fairly good time balance between sections.	The visuals are used very effectively. Excellent example of how to use the visuals to support own storytelling. Excellent stage presence. Excellent time management, good time balance between sections.	20%
Presentation content	Displayed a poor grasp of the material. Demonstrated a weak handling of content, application and implications.	Displayed an insufficient grasp of the material. Demonstrated a superficial handling of content, application and implications.	Displayed a general grasp of the material. Demonstrated good mastery of content, application and implications.	Displayed an excellent grasp of the material. Demonstrated excellent mastery of content, application and implications.	50%
Peer assessment	Evaluated by fellow students based on the above three criteria. The final grade for this criteria will be the average of all the peer assessments.				10%
TOTAL					100%

Assessment model for assignment 2, Group Project

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (< 5.5)	Partially Proficient (5.5 < 6.5)	Proficient (6.5 < 7.5)	Exemplary (≥ 7.5)	Rating
Structure and Argumentation	Often unclear and disorganized. The report is confusing and difficult to follow. Conceptually confused. Project is poorly written and shows a serious inability to present a logical argumentation. Superficial presentation of content.	Not always clear or concise. Organization is adequate, but weak. Occasionally wandered and was sometimes difficult to follow. Generally competently written, although some problems exist in logical organization of arguments and text. Imprecise presentation of content.	Usually clear, concise, well organized. Most of the project was easy to follow. Good command of expression and logical argument. Adequate presentation of content.	Consistently clear, concise, well organized. Points were easy to follow because of the organizations. Outstanding command of expression and logical argument. Concise and precise presentation of content.	20%
Project content	Displayed a poor grasp of the material. Demonstrated a superficial handling of content, application and implications. Little depth of research	Displayed some problems with the understanding of the material. Handling of content, application and implications OK. Adequate depth of research.	Displayed a general grasp of the material. Demonstrated good mastery of content, application and implications. Good research depth.	Displayed an excellent grasp of the material. Demonstrated excellent mastery of content, application and implications. Excellent research depth.	60%
Process (evaluated by team members on each other)	The student needed a lot of help from others. The allocated tasks were never done. Did not participate in the discussions at all. The student did not contribute to the end result. The student only rarely uses others' feedback to significantly improve the work.	The student needed a lot of help from others. The allocated tasks were often not done on time or incomplete. Did not participate proactively in the discussions. The student rarely contributes to the end result. The student did not always use others' feedback to improve the works.	The student worked quite independently and cooperatively. Most of the allocated tasks were done on time. Participated mostly proactively in the discussions. The student contributed somewhat to the end result. The student made adequate use of others' feedback	The student worked very independently and cooperatively. The allocated tasks were always done on time. Participated proactively in the discussions. The student contributed significantly toward the end result. The student made excellent use of others' feedback.	10%
				TOTAL	100%

* These criteria will not be graded, but if missing or incomplete, the assignment will be rejected. The use of proper business English) is required in all written work. In case of a 'weak' score on the business English and layout criterion, the report will be directly graded with a '1' without further taking into account the other grading criteria.

Assessment model for assignment 3, Individual project (pass/fail)

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (< 5.5)	Partially Proficient ($5.5 < 6.5$)	Proficient ($6.5 < 7.5$)	Exemplary (≥ 7.5)	Rating
Online Structure	Often unclear and disorganized. The page design is confusing and difficult to follow.	Not always clear or concise.	Usually clear, concise, well organized.	Consistently clear, concise, well organized. Features were easy to follow.	20%
Content	Displayed a poor grasp of the material. Demonstrated a superficial handling of content, application and implications. Little depth of research	Displayed some problems with the understanding of the material. Handling of content, application and implications OK. Adequate depth of research.	Displayed a general grasp of the material. Demonstrated good mastery of content, application and implications. Good research depth.	Displayed an excellent grasp of the material. Demonstrated excellent mastery of content, application and implications. Excellent research depth.	80%
TOTAL					100%
<p>* These criteria will not be graded, but if missing or incomplete, the assignment will be rejected. The use of proper business English (as described in the IBS Reporting Guidelines) is required in all written work. In case of a 'weak' score on the business English and layout criterion, the report will be directly graded with a '1' without further taking into account the other grading criteria.</p>					