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Introduction

In the past few years companies have increasingly been adapting user generated media into their websites. Earlier websites was considered an online advertisement or a calling card for the company where consumers could find product descriptions as well as contact information to the company. However, with the explosion of web 2.0 companies have seen the possibilities and advantages of having user generated content.

In September 2009 Gyldendal launched a new website. Gyldendal is Denmark’s oldest publishing house, founded in 1775. Being not only the house of the most famous classical authors it is also one of the biggest publishing houses in the country. The site is interesting, as it lets users contribute to the site content, thereby making Gyldendal the first Danish publishing house to take advantage of user generated media. The interesting point is what consequences gyldendal.dk has for the book as a social object, by attaching the users and facilitating user interaction in different degrees. In this paper we will present our research done at gyldendal.dk.

Research question

How does Gyldendal use gyldendal.dk to promote books and authors?

We will be focusing on these points:

- In what degree is user generated media incorporated on gyldendal.dk?
- What type of relationship is established between the authors and the readers?

In order to answer our research question our point of departure will be an in-depth interview with the key developer of gyldendal.dk, Jesper Green. In the paper we will use the insight drawn from the interview to further structure our own investigation and analysis of the site. Furthermore focus on the introduction of the theme “how to prolong the lifespan of a book” – a theme that is correlated to our research question. Finally, we will end up discussion implications of the current structure for the future site.
Motivation

We wish to explore Gyldendal’s marketing methods and considerations regarding structure and design of their user generated website. We wish to figure out what Gyldendal can gain from user interaction and if this can promote books and authors. Another interesting aspect is if user generated sites such as Gyldendal are changing the relationship readers have with a book into a social object.
Method

Research site and population
Our research is centralized around a website belonging to one of Denmark’s biggest publishing houses, www.gyldendal.dk. As stated in the introduction Gyldendal recently built and launched a new website which takes advantage of user generated media - a term we will define later in this paper.

We have conducted an interview with, the main creator and key person behind the new website Jesper Green, to get a better understanding of the ideas behind the website and the motivation for making a new site with increasing user-generated content.

One of our group members has been a trainee at Gyldendal until a few months before the new site was launched. Therefore she possesses insights about the organization and the website. Besides being an advantage we are aware that this can also have an influence on our understanding of the research we conduct and the questions we ask (Schwarz 1999). We do however not consider this a problem in our research.¹

We have divided our research into two main areas; the interview with the creator and an observation of the site. In the interview we have focused on the ideas behind the website, the implementation, hopes and goals for Gyldendal as well as their future strategies for the site. In the observations of the website our main focus has been the current use of the site and possibilities for user interaction. We are here relying on what Shani Orgad calls “online data”.²

Collection of data and analysis
We are using two types of research methods: Interview and “virtual observation”.

We have conducted a qualitative semi-structured interview with the main creator of the site. We used semi-structured interview³ where we, as interviewers structured some questions in advance, but were open to the responses and ready to follow leads that the interviewee (Green) was

---

1 It is none the less important to state the relationship between the subject being studied and the researchers as stated by Uwe Flick (Flick 2006).
2 Orgad 2008
3 Flick 2006, p. 155
presenting. We used this approach in order to get a bigger understanding of the ideas behind the site. Klaus Bruhn Jensen indicates several things to take into consideration when planning and executing interviews. These are among others the duration, structure and depth.\textsuperscript{4} The interview lasted just over an hour, and during this time we had Green elaborate further on aspects which we found interesting to our research.

We did a virtual observation of the website and the interaction possibilities on the site, both between users and between users and Gyldendal.

The data collected was analyzed by the use of grounded theory coding where we use the empirical data as the basis of our exploration.\textsuperscript{5} We start by coding the interview in order to see what this suggests about the bigger picture. We will present the findings from the empirical data later in this paper.

\textsuperscript{4} Jensen 2002, p. 242
\textsuperscript{5} Flick 2006, p. 309; Jensen 2002, p. 247-8;
Empirical findings

The following is a presentation of our empirical findings from the interview conducted with Jesper Green from Gyldendal as well as our investigation of gyldendal. dk and intern knowledge about the publishing house. As the site is constantly changing we have included screen dumps off the site in appendix A.

Reasons for launching a new site

Gyldendal launched a new site because the old site consisted of an online bookstore, which created a conflict of interest as the bookstores felt that Gyldendal being a publishing house were cutting them off asmiddlemen when they sold books directly from their own site. Gyldendal therefore decided to create a new website that could be a “presentation window” of Gyldendal as a publishing house as well as presenting the literature which Gyldendal publish. Gyldendal think of itself as having a public service obligation. Green indicated that when launching the site they had an obligation to be old fashioned and conservative, because of Gyldendals history, however they also wanted to develop and grow. Another reason for launching the site was to prolong the lifespan of books through user generated content. Green also emphasized that Gyldendal haven’t advertised for the new site before or after the launch.

Marketing problem

Before the launch of the new site Gyldendal had a big problem with online marketing. They lacked the knowledge which resulted in online marketing methods and systems getting a low priority. They used to buy bad standard sites for the big selling authors for the cost of 50.000-100.000 DKK. At the same time authors began promoting and branding themselves on sites like facebook, blogs and the like, detaching themselves online from the publishing house. Green also focused on the problem that some books are only interesting to a small niche group, which decreases the possibility of marketing the material in main stream media like prime time television resulting in very little promotion for that type of books. By bringing the books to one big website, “narrow titles” can be exposed to a bigger audience than they would on several small sites targeting one audience. Green explained that when he, himself was published in 1992, he used to “prolong the
life of his book” by constantly writing features for the newspapers. With ICTs he believes authors need a platform that is consistent. For him it was a logical step forward to make the site with inspiration from incorporated bulletin boards and social media like Facebook.

**gyldendal.dk**

The point of gyldendal.dk is catering to literature and the public service obligation in general. The site is deliberately created simple, because Green believes simplicity to be gratifying for the user. The focus on the website is on the author. Through the commentary threads the users are able to write to the authors and interact with them, this helps keep the book interesting and it can expand the life of the book. The books with the most comments attached are displayed on the front page. The website has also provided a star-rating system on the books. However, Green does not consider this to be a vital object to draw attention to the books on the front page. The site is considered to be the bonus material (know from DVD’s) but for books, it is important in order to add extra value to the customer, but also to the authors which can keep them loyal towards Gyldendal.

It is clear that Gyldendal also considered the promoting value of the site with positive outcome of generating sales, pointing out that the slide show on the front page was designed with pictures of authors looking out at the user and thus addresses one directly. At the same time Gyldendal wanted the search field to simulate a librarian, calmly helping one towards the right findings. Another way of promoting is the use of opinion leaders. Green mentioned he has a handful of people he occasionally sends books to, in the hope that they will comment books on the site.

Green pointed out that the site was launched in stages, so the whole site isn’t available yet. The first stage is the display of titles that is currently on the site. Second stage is the launching of an “author universe” where the authors will get their own blogs and profiles on gyldendal.dk. The authors are obligated to edit their own sites. One goal of the site is to make gyldendal.dk a centralized place for their authors and readers rather than “just another site on the internet” (our translation of the interview). Third stage is a launching of a “topic universe” where different topics can be discussed.

---

6 That was at a time where the media mainly consisted of “the old media”
**Target groups on the website**

In the interview Green defined three target groups, the first one being “Niche readers” who are interested in a relatively narrow topic which does not appeal to the general public. They are readers who seek information elsewhere than the main stream media. Green exemplified with a book about Danish fossils which he admitted being a difficult book to promote and even getting the attention of the key audience and their friends. Green found 30 fossils-clubs in Denmark with about 30 members each. He called the clubs and asked if they wanted to review the books and they went crazy. “It is even better than main stream television” Green exclaimed, “because this is my key audience. This is my 100 perfect users.” A concept he became keen on thinking of when creating the website: “Providing a platform where niche groups can reach each other. They can use gyldendal.dk to discuss fossils.” Other target groups Green defined was culturally interested +60 readers and scholars.

**Authors on the site and general user navigating**

Green’s goal is to get authors accustomed to using gyldendal.dk as a platform for promoting their books and themselves. He already sees excellent results of authors getting the idea of how commentaries can get a book on the front page. An example is the book *Mit venskab med Jesus Kristus* from 2008. It is an old title but suddenly it pops up with a lot of high ratings and commentaries, partly because the author is very active in the discussions. When this happens Gyldendal wants to reward this by putting the book on the front page, generating more attention to the book, because it has shown to attract the user’s attention. Another example of a book that has reached the front page is *Røde Kai*. This is a biography about an old hustler Kai Bo Rasmussen, who has been so active in the commentary thread, that it has placed him on top of the front page. Rasmussen has really “gotten what it is all about, knowing to be at the exact spot where all the readers and potential readers are”. One day he called Green and said: “Jesper, I think I just made a huge blunder. I was logged in as Lilly Thomsen and then I replied as Lilly Thomsen as well”. Meaning that Rasmussen has created multiple false profiles and is having conversations with himself to bring the book on the front page, and thereby getting more attention.
The content of the commentary sections is not controlled or screened by Gyldendal, which provides the users with free artistic expression. It is the users that create the content, which Green is pleased with, since he does not want a huge work burden. However, the commentaries can sometimes be negative and if users write profane language to describe the authors, Green will be inclined to delete them.

Green stated that having to create a profile before being able to comment was just a way to sort out the worst of users. Making it a little difficult he hopes to decrease the amount of users that will comment about nothing or gibberish. However Green also stressed that there should be no hindrances once being in dialogue with other users.
Theories

User Generated Media/New Media

New media can according to Lievrouw and Livingstone (2006) be characterized as being both the instrument and the product of social shaping and also their particular social consequences.\(^7\)

The difference between new media and the old media is the increased role users’ play, especially their ability to modify and redistribute content.\(^8\) Users of new media are more selective in their choice of information sources and their interaction with others. Information is perceived and preserved selectively and with new media the users can also generate, seek and share content selectively.\(^9\)

Shao (2008) argues that User Generated Media (UGM) is changing the world of communication and information fundamentally, especially by its self-sufficient nature and large audience size. The earliest types of UGM were seen on the Yahoo and AOL bulletin boards. Overtime UGM has evolved and now include blogs, wikis, picture-sharing and social networking-sites among others. Shao defines UGM as follows “…they refer to the new media whose content is made publicly available over the Internet…”\(^10\). Shao refers to a study by Nielsen/NetRatings from 2006, five out of ten US top growing websites are user generated sites.\(^11\)

What makes people use UGM

Shao argues for three ways individual users deal with UGM:

1) Consuming – The people who never participate but only watch, view and read.

2) Participating – The people who interact with each other and/or the content, such as ranking, commenting and sharing.

\(^7\) Lievrouw & Livingstone 2006, p. 23
\(^8\) Ibid.
\(^9\) Ibid p. 25
\(^10\) Shao 2008, p. 8
\(^11\) Ibid
3) Producing – People who create and publish their own material.\(^{12}\)

Even though people deal with UGM in one of these three ways, there are still many differences in each category, people consume the information differently and for different purposes and gratifications. This point will be looked at further when discussing the theory of uses and gratification. The two main motives for using user generated sites are information seeking and entertainment.\(^{13}\) It is however important to point out that people are not just one or the other but both of them in different degrees and situations.

**Two-step-flow theory**

In the 1950’s a growing concern about the power of the mass media led to a publication from Lazarsfeld and Katz about *personal influence* which led to the theories of two-step-flow, opinion leaders and communities as filters for mass media. The book was a milestone within the research of mass communication.\(^{14}\)

The theory of opinion leaders was further developed through a behavioural study of voting activities done by Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet (1948), to a two-step flow of communication theory. The theory emphasises that ideas often flow from radio and print media to opinion leaders and from them to the general public. The theory describes opinion leaders as the direct receivers of information from impersonal mass-media sources. The opinion leaders interpret the information received and pass it on to the masses. They become the middlemen between the impersonal mass-media and society.\(^{15}\) The earlier theories believed that the audience consisted of a mass of disconnected individuals hooked up to the media. The analysis of the two step flow showed that the media was less automatic than first assumed.\(^{16}\)

\(^{12}\) Ibid p. 9 \\
\(^{13}\) Ibid p. 10 \\
\(^{14}\) Park and Pooley. 2008 P.251 \\
\(^{15}\) Jin, Bloch, & Cameron .2002, p.7 \\
\(^{16}\) Katz 1957. p. 61-78
Opinion leaders

The concept of opinion leaders arose out of the two step flow theory. Opinion leaders form and reflect upon absorbed information received through various means. They introduce new opinions and influence lower media users’ attitudes towards a subject.\(^\text{17}\)

Opinion Leaders and the web – E-pinions

A study made by Yan et al. (2002) introduces the concept, e-pinions which according to them are the new online influentials. The study compares the traditional word of mouth and opinion leaders to the change of online communities and their influentials. \(^\text{18}\) E-pinions are defined as “…non-professional consumers’ opinions about a specific product, service or brand…” \(^\text{19}\) The article argues that personal source is the most important source of information online. \(^\text{20}\) More and more consumers use online media to make better buying decisions. \(^\text{21}\) There are two types of e-pinion givers, those who are paid to do so and those who are unpaid. The unpaid e-pinion givers get self-satisfaction or gratifications from opinion seekers/receivers. There are two ways for the unpaid e-pinions to get gratification 1) by getting to talk about a product they love and 2) by helping others (thereby also indirectly promoting themselves). \(^\text{22}\)

Lemi Baruh argues that recommendations coming from strong ties\(^\text{23}\) such as family and friends are more likely to be trustworthy and relevant to ones needs. The chapter further argues that because of the internet network structure and the synchronic connection between many users, an online word of mouth can reach more people than the traditional word of mouth. \(^\text{24}\)

\(^{17}\) Song, Chi, Hino & Tseng, intet årstal p. 971

\(^{18}\) Yan et al 2002.

\(^{19}\) Ibid, p. 3

\(^{20}\) Ibid, p. 8

\(^{21}\) Ibid, p. 3

\(^{22}\) Ibid, p. 4

\(^{23}\) Granovetter, 1983.

\(^{24}\) Baruh 2009, p. 37
**The Uses and Gratification Theory**

**Origins**

The origins of the uses and gratifications (U&G) theory can be traced back to early media effect studies in the 1940's conducted by Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Elihu Katz. The studies contained research on how tightly knit communities related to massive media messages. These studies became the foundation to later research that was more sociology based, with everyday life and media as a central aspect. It focused firstly on opinion leaders (two-step hypothesis) and secondly the paradigm in strong media effects also known as the hyperaemic needle which suggests the intended message from the media is directly received and completely accepted by the receiver.

The U&G theory was developed through research on the effectiveness of the radio medium and sought to explain audience motivation and behaviour based on needs. The term gratification was linked together with usage satisfaction by psychologist Herta Herzog. From late 1950’s onwards most of the U&G studies were concerned with the social and psychological aspects and the concept of need, being inspired by the social psychologist Maslow and his hierarchy of needs.

To sum it up the main objective of U&G theory is to explain why people use media, what kinds of psychological needs and wants motivate them to engage with the medium. Typologies for uses of mass media consumption have identified a broad range of gratifications people gain from mediated-communication. These include (authors of typologies in parentheses) socialization (Korganokar & Wolin 1999), pastime and information seeking (Papacharissi & Rubin 2000), entertainment (Luo 2002), personal status (Song et al 2004) and social interaction (Ko, Cho and Roberts 2005).

---

25 Gripsrud 2002, p. 50
26 Henriksen 2001, p. 31
27 Luo 2002, p. 2
28 Gripsrud, p. 51
29 Chung 2006, p. 6
U&G theory focus points online

With the addition of the internet as a medium the U&G theory has been used to explore and explain audience behaviour online. The U&G theory’s role in the 21st century has not changed significantly with the explosion of the internet as a medium channel. Research conducted with U&G theory in mind has typically focused on how media are used to satisfy both personal (including personal identity, escape and self-presentation) and entertainment needs.\(^{30}\) A research conducted by Stafford and Gonier (2004) shows several gratifications from internet use that motivates user’s behaviour such as web searching and the ability to engage in interpersonal communication and socialization\(^{31}\) Other studies emphasize self-presentation, image building, relaxation and fun as important motivational factors for seeking the internet as the medium for satisfaction of needs.\(^{32}\) Through interpersonal communication Papacharissi and Alan M. Rubin\(^{33}\) (2000) suggest that the internet as a medium can satisfy the user through interaction with functions such as email and chat rooms. Observing other user’s behaviour can also induce a gratification.\(^{34}\)

Criticisms

Since the blossoming of U&G, the theory has been questioned as a slightly problematic way of conducting media research. The theory is based on the audience already being aware of their basic needs and consciously seeking to fulfil them and get gratification through choice of media. This indicates that the audiences have a full overview of their psyches and therefore are complete rational in their behaviour.\(^{35}\)

Another critique point to the U&G theory is that the theory is oblivion to the fact that people have unconscious dimensions to their psyche and sometimes act irrationally or in ways that cannot be

---

\(^{30}\) Rubin 2002, p. 538  
\(^{31}\) Stafford 2004, p. 108  
\(^{32}\) Urista 2009, p. 5  
\(^{33}\) Alan M. Rubin is a notable theorist in the U&G. In the 1980’s and 90’s he identified specific types of media orientation as well as types of users interaction with the media.  
\(^{34}\) Ibid.  
\(^{35}\) Rubin, p. 531 & Gripsrud, p. 51
justified.\textsuperscript{36} Other critique points focus on the lack of consideration for cultural or social implications of media use, lack of clarity on how researchers attach different meanings to users’ actions.\textsuperscript{37}

**Applying the U&G theory to the context of gyldendal.dk**

Many studies done with the U&G theory in hand have been quantitative based research. Providing audiences on websites with questionnaires asking them about their experiences seems to be the way to go.\textsuperscript{38} However, since gyldendal.dk is newly launched it has not been our main focus to establish a quantitative research based on respondents that frequently visit the site, as there would be very few data. We have instead focused on what kind factors Gyldendal seek to gratify the audience with, when visiting the site.

**Elaboration Likelihood Model**

Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) was introduced in the 1980’s by Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo. In the text “The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion”\textsuperscript{39} they present their ideas behind the ELM. The main objective of ELM theory is that there is a difference in how people process a message depending on their involvement. Petty and Cacioppo talk about elaboration likelihood and point out that it can be either high or low. When conditions are present that foster people’s motivation and ability to engage in issue-thinking, elaboration likelihood is high and likewise there are factors that reduce the recipients’ ability or motivation to think about an issue, and then the elaboration likelihood is low.\textsuperscript{40} These two situations form different routes of persuasion, a central and a peripheral route. Petty and Cacioppo stress that the two routes are a continuum and not two exclusive types of message processing. Furthermore they argue that “…the critical difference is the manner in which an individual relates this incoming information to her prior knowledge.” \textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{36} Gripsrud, p. 51
\textsuperscript{37} Rubin, p. 530-531
\textsuperscript{38} Chung and Yoo, Urista et al.
\textsuperscript{39} Petty & Cacioppo 1984
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid, p. 673
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, p. 673-674
By routes Petty and Cacioppo mean that a recipient will process the message in different ways depending on the conditions under which they meet the message. In order to persuade a recipient, it is vital to be aware of the two routes, and in which degree they are most likely to process the message through them, as this will have an impact on the design and contents of the persuasive message. In the text “An Application of the Elaboration Likelihood Model” by routes Petty and Cacioppo mean that a recipient will process the message in different ways depending on the conditions under which they meet the message. In order to persuade a recipient, it is vital to be aware of the two routes, and in which degree they are most likely to process the message through them, as this will have an impact on the design and contents of the persuasive message. In the text “An Application of the Elaboration Likelihood Model” by Jerry B. Gotlieb and John E. Swan expresses it this way: “Thus a message will result in different outcomes depending upon whether peripheral or central processing occurs.” In the following sections we will take a deeper look at the two routes presented in the ELM.

**The central route**

The central route to persuasion occurs when elaboration likelihood is high, as stated above. The motivation and ability to process the message is therefore central. Gotlieb and Swan state that in order to predict the effect of persuasive arguments one must consider two important variables, motivation and the ability to process.

The recipient will lack motivation to process the message if they don’t care about the topic at hand or if they cannot comprehend it. For example, if an internet user is presented with a message about a book on raising children, but don’t have any kids of their own, they are not likely to be motivated to process the message. Also if they have trouble understanding the message because it is describes in unknown words to the recipient, or if they are distracted by other simultaneous messages asking for their attention, they will lack the ability to process the message.

Therefore, if the sender wants to make sure the recipient take the central route of processing he needs to make sure they are both motivated and able to process the message. If this succeeds and the message is processed through the central route there will be a more thoughtful consideration of the arguments within the message. The message is then put through extensive consideration of the arguments within the message. The message is then put through extensive

---

42 Gotlieb & Swan 1999
43 Ibid, p. 222
44 Ibid, p. 221; p. 227
45 Of course they could be working with children or something like that, but the point being that not all messages is relevant for all recipients.
46 Gotlieb & Swan, p. 221
and effortful scrutinizing from the point of the recipient to be persuaded,\textsuperscript{47} and often the message is based on rational arguments.\textsuperscript{48} This scrutinizing of the message is also more likely to make a more lasting impression, leading to more enduring attitude change of both favorable and unfavorable nature.\textsuperscript{49} Often central processing of messages is based on rational arguments, which tends to last longer.

**The peripheral route**

The recipient is likely to take the peripheral route if they are unable or unwilling to use much thought on the message. Petty and Wegner point out that the attitude change connected with the peripheral route “…are based on a variety of attitude change processes that typically require less cognitive effort.”\textsuperscript{50}

While the central route is based on rational arguments, messages perceived on the peripheral route will be based on emotional aspects. Here different persuasive arguments are less informative, instead there is an extensive use of peripheral cues such as graphics, colors, setting, spokespersons (e.g. celebrities) and emotional tone of the message.\textsuperscript{51}

A recipient can be persuaded with an argument simply because the source appears to be an expert on the field or is attractive in different ways. Also the whole setting with lively colors can make it attractive and seem convincing for the recipient. But a persuasion based on the peripheral route is less predictable and less likely to be sustainable. In other words, peripheral cues can be a short-cut to quick persuasion.\textsuperscript{52}

**ELM and the internet/social media**

The two routes described in the ELM are translated to internet users in the text “Homepage as an advertisement”\textsuperscript{53} by Surendra N. Singh and Nikunj R Dalai. They divide internet users into two

\textsuperscript{47} Petty & Wegner 1999, p. 42  
\textsuperscript{48} Singh & Dalai 1999, p. 94  
\textsuperscript{49} Petty & Wegner, p. 43 (see figure)  
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, p. 42  
\textsuperscript{51} Singh & Dalai, p. 94-95  
\textsuperscript{52} Petty & Wegner  
\textsuperscript{53} Singh & Dalai
groups: Surfers and searchers. Surfers desire entertainment and stimulation, but only linger for a short period on the site and then move on. Searchers on the other hand are more goal-oriented and looking for specific information. They are more likely to stay on a website for a longer period of time. The authors argue that to persuade the surfer the peripheral route is the best suited, whereas the central route is the most optimal way to persuade the searchers.

**Primary, secondary and tertiary texts**

In his book “Television Culture” John Fiske uses a distinction between primary, secondary and tertiary texts on TV. However, the distinction applies to other texts as well, such as books. Fiske talks about the primary text being the book itself, the secondary is the reviews and criticism and finally the tertiary text are those produced by the readers themselves for example in form of the interaction and conversation between readers.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Fiske 1988, p. 108ff
Analyzes

Our analysis of the interview with Jesper Green from Gyldendal revealed two interesting themes the site is centralized around. Jesper called these “mantras” and talked about them as main focus points when developing gyldendal.dk. He saw them as foundations for the site. The first of these is the name of the site “Gyldendal - hvor forfatterne er” (Gyldendal – where the authors are). The catch phrase gives an immediate understanding of what the site is about. - This is where you can meet the authors. The second “mantra” he mentioned was “how to prolong the lifespan of books”. Hereby wanting to keep a book from being forgotten about the instant it has been reviewed and thereby prolonging the period the book will be sold. In the following we will look closer at these underlying themes.

1. How to prolong the lifespan of books

As mentioned above, one of Gyldendal’s main reasons for creating the site was to help the authors prolong the lifespan of their books. In the following we will look into some of the implications of this but first some background information for the site.

With the constant fight of attention in the media and the rising amount of information available, books seem to have a hard time getting attention. When a book does get attention it is often only mentioned once in the media and quickly gone again. As mentioned earlier a lot of books also have a limited target group. These are the barriers Gyldendal is trying to find a way to overcome through the new site.

The site creates a platform for the author to create and maintain awareness and a special focus on their books. It also gives the authors and readers a place to interact with each other, and as such the relationship between authors, readers and books become changed. It is no longer just a book, but a ticket to interaction with people. We see that Gyldendal tries to reconfigure the book as a social object. We will return to this discussion in the end of this paper.

A website has long been considered an advertisement or calling card for a company, and a place to find simple information. With the development of UGM the possibilities of a website have changed to a tool where companies can interact with the users, and thus tie a stronger link to
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them (cf. Granovetter 1983. This is also the case for Gyldendal’s site. It is an advertisement for all of their books, with special emphasis on some of them (cf. the big banner running across the front page), but at the same time the site tries to generate a connection between the user and the author. They do this by facilitating interaction between authors and readers (we will return to the user interaction shortly).

This connection is according to Green, also important for the relationship between Gyldendal and the authors. Usually authors shift publishing house once in a while, which Gyldendal is trying to prevent, by giving the authors more than just a published book. One of these “extra things” is the website, which Green calls “…the bonus material we know from DVD’s, but for books” (from the interview with Green, our translation). Hereby he is indicating the added value for both the reader and the author that the site constitutes.

Green emphasized several times throughout the interview that he considered the site “philanthropy”, but drawing on this concept of bonus material it is clear that the added value for the potential customers is intended to lead to an increased sale. In other words the site can be viewed as a way to promote books and authors by creating ties between authors, readers and Gyldendal.

Finally, Green comments on the use of one centralized site instead of several different sites. Talking about being exposed to a bigger audience on the website instead of several smaller sites Green emphasizes that the site and the authors can benefit from each other as the site grow.

We see that Gyldendal has used different techniques to allow the authors to prolong the lifespan of books. In the following paragraphs we will analyze this further.

2. How to attract users visually

Above we have been working with the fundamental concept behind the site. If the site is to promote books and authors, some key points are: Does the site attract the users? Does it use visual impression in order to get their attention and get them to use and return to the site?

First of all the site needs to take account of the different kinds of users that we can expect will interact with it. As presented earlier the ELM talks about two main internet users: searcher and surfer, here stressing that these should be considered ideal types more than actual users. The
searchers have the information seeking motivation as presented in the UGM paragraph, as well as the surfer has the entertainment motivation. As we have two ideal types of users, with different needs the site has to fulfil several needs at the same time. It is vital to keep in mind that a user has a goal in mind when using the media (cf. U&G). This goal can be either explicit as with searchers, finding specific information, or it can be more fluid and undetermined as with the surfer, where the goal is centred around being entertained rather than getting information.

In the case of gyldendal.dk we see that the large banner in the middle of the front page relates to the peripheral route, with its use of peripheral cues in the design. These cues include the use of graphics, colours and setting of the author on the banner, but also the emotional tone in the text. It is clear that this part is focused at the surfer, coming by the site, and aimed at attracting their attention through the peripheral route.

Green pointed out that they made a very large search field on the site, thus making it easy for the searcher to accomplish their goal. With users highly motivated to search, and the message easy to process (a search field is a standard, and they included explanation text), these users are addressed and cared for.

There can be many other types of searchers and surfers using the media with different goals. As this paper isn’t focused on the user perspective, we will only point out that the gratification is implemented for example in the above, but also for entertainment in the easy access to new books and user comments (menu with ranking according to most commented).

3. User interaction

gyldendal.dk has provided different platforms for interaction on the website. In the following we will describe some of them, the star-rating system, the commentary threads and the ability to share information. As well as how the different types of users will interact in this setting and how it brings gratification to them.

Star-rating system

The star-rating system is a way for the users to rate the books, they have read. The users are able to rate a book by giving it 1-5 stars. The ratings are not limited by user profiles but by cookies and
IP-addresses. Each time, a book is rated, it is immediately included in the overall rating count of each book. Even though gyldendal.dk has chosen not to focus on the rating system on the front page, this system is vital for promoting books. It is a way for user’s to immediately get gratification through a very simple interaction. It is not a requirement for the users to write sentences but in just a click of a button, the users can partake in an interaction where their opinion is stated, and thereby getting gratification by being a part of something without engaging further. No longer are books reviewed and rated by “arbiters of taste” in the media, whose opinion can make a difference in sales – now it is the user’s opinions that are visible and their taste that counts. The e-pinion will receive gratification by the fact that he is interacting in a setting where his opinion makes a difference in ratings.

The star-rating system gives users a reason to visit the website occasionally or. For example, an author will most likely follow the development of the rating of his book, the consuming user is looking for entertainment in the star-rating and the e-pinion is looking for a chance to matter and have an impact on others by sharing his or her opinion.

Commentary threads

gyldendal.dk has created a commentary section under each book on the website. The comments provided by users immediately pop up on the book and are part of the race to become the top commented book and as a consequence be showed on the front page.

Instant gratification for consuming and participating users

The platform provided affords instant gratification for numerous types of users. The consuming user will receive gratification in entertainment and information by surfing around and viewing the commentaries. The participating user receives gratification by the way that the users are able to interact with each other in the commentary section. Even though this is a limited interaction, since the users can only converse through commentaries on a single book, and it is no way as fulfilling as forums for chat and debates, the commentary section is used for interaction (See appendix B).
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The users are not able to follow other user’s profiles, nor are they able to follow other user’s action and see what they comment on, read or their specific use of the website.

**Interaction with and by the authors**

The commentary count on the front page encourages the author to be active in the commentary section in order to get his book displayed on the front page. The author receives immediate gratification from other users commenting on books and users receive gratification from talking to authors. This could potentially drive the focus away from the content of the book, because the virtual meeting of the author is more interesting for some. But the fact that the attention is on the author and not on a particular book gives gratification as previously published titles are also being promoted.

The more delinquent the author is to comment and interact with the users in the commentary section, the better commented his book is and it will appear on the front page – and provide more attention to the book and therefore gain a better promotion. Even though it has been a while since the publishing date, it will still keep the attention on the book and be a gratification for the author and a gratification for Gyldendal if it results in a sale. However there is a problem, in our investigation, we learned that users (including authors) are able to create fake profiles on the website and thus create a false interaction in the commentary section. The result of this is a top ranking on the front page. However humorous, this can cause an issue of trust to the commentary-system and general reviews on the site.\(^ {57} \)

The searcher (as describe in ELM theory above) will seek gratification in the top ranked commentaries on the front page. Many or good comments might encourage the searcher, offering inspiration for what to give grandma for Christmas.

**Providing a virtual meeting through commentaries for niche-groups**

Certain books are “narrow titles” aimed at the target group for certain niche-groups. This provides a certain gratification to finally having a virtual place for the niche-group to meet and comment on a specific book within their interest – a place they might not have elsewhere, being scattered geographically. In the interview Green spoke of promoting books for niche groups through small mailed newsletters. These niche groups would meet up and talk about their subject in remote

\(^ {57} \) http://tinyurl.com/y9y8c6t (see also appendix C)
areas making it hard for Gyldendal to integrate and promote books. By providing a platform for commentary, Gyldendal moves the meeting to a public virtual place, giving the book an opportunity to receive a bigger audience, through the network of the niche-groups.

*The intellectual mark – providing a platform for e-pinions*

The commentary thread also provides gratification for the e-pinions. The fact that they are able to comment and see the visual results immediately provides them with an instant gratification. Some e-pinions might even be inclined to give notice of their comments, by linking to the commentaries from social networking sites, in e-mails and in chat rooms. Although, this act of self presentation it is indeed not with the focus of the message of the book in mind, but instead marketing of the e-pinion’s own image the act also promote Gyldendal’s books. The e-pinion’s gratification is achieved by simply stating the fact, that he has read the book and commented on this on Gyldendal’s website. Green stated in the interview that Denmark is a cultural developing country: “To even say that you have read any type of book marks you as an intellectual.” The gratification e-pinions get when linking to the commentaries provided, is building up an image as being an intellectual. Having the time to read a book, being patient and intellectual enough to read it through in its entirety and even define an opinion about the content will awake any e-pinion’s selfish desire to brag.

**Possibilities for sharing**

*The share-button*

The website is not created around user profiles and it is impossible for a user to show his or her individual taste in books. However, by implementing a share button on the website, Gyldendal has provided users with a way to share taste in books by linking to their own profile on social network sites. Creating attention around the book on their individual network gives opinion leaders a way to promote books to their network and people who “follow” them. That way, opinion leaders will recommend books to close ties in their network in a sufficient and instant way. This will in the end lead to more people visiting Gyldendal’s site as well as more people being aware of a book and in the generate a sale.
**How Gyldendal is using opinion leaders’ networking to promote books**

Gyldendal is according to Green using opinion leaders. However, the website does not set a visible platform for them to interact on gyldendal.dk. The way Gyldendal is actively using opinion leaders is by having selected a handful of people that Green is sending books to, in the hope that they will read the book and spread the word in their networks online and offline, and preferably on the site by writing commentaries. (This idea was in fact already incorporated on Gyldendal’s site for children’s books earlier in 2009 before the new user-generated site was launched. A bigger selection of children was sent books and encouraged to review the books in their networks and on social networking sites. A group was created on facebook to provide a platform for the children and their friends to meet and write about the book. 58 This was very beneficial for Gyldendal and Green argues that they soon will be doing more in this genre on the new site.

4. **Reconfiguring the book as a social object**

In the following we will discuss some of the consequences for the book as a social object starting from John Fiske’s distinction between primary, secondary and tertiary texts. 59

Considering that books are normally read in private, we can use classical communication theories such as “sender – message – receiver”, to understand the communication. We see a picture of this in Figure 1. Books can in some ways be considered almost anti-social, as there is no direct interaction. However, books might be read in private, but they constitute a social object that gives rise for a community (cf. Fiske about tertiary text). The book becomes the foundation for interaction among readers (and in part none-readers) in the form of tertiary text productions. This tertiary text production (talking about and around the book) is not a new phenomenon it has always been going on within reading groups and meetings between authors and readers etc. According to Fiske 60 tertiary texts are not just a result of text reading, but a determining factor for how readers decode texts. Fiske gives an example of young girls reading their own sub-cultural meanings into an icon such as Madonna. These tertiary text created by the users are in effect constructive for the meaning of

58 www.tinyurl.com/ybgx48q (see also appendix D)
59 Fiske
the texts. In other words there is no direct transfer of meaning from the author to the readers as indicated in the classical sender – message – receiver theory presented above.

In the case of gyldendal.dk we see the tertiary text production being produced to and on the site both in the form of ratings and commentaries. What is interesting about the site is that it provides a platform for the tertiary texts and as such facilitates it. Green recognized this in the interview by stating that he wanted to create a platform for the interaction between authors and the readers, a platform that was to allow the authors the possibility of prolonging the lifespan of their books. What he didn’t mention, was the interaction between readers. It seems as the communication between author and reader is still what Gyldendal consider essential. Though this might be significant so is the interaction between readers in general.61

From the viewpoint of Gyldendal this platform provides direct responses back to the publisher and allows for monitoring of the actions and production of tertiary texts on the site. It opens the possibilities of creating social communities not least in the case of niche areas. But at the same time this platform only facilitates a certain kind of tertiary texts. As we have pointed out earlier the lack of user profiles, information about their actions and interaction possibilities is a limitation on the site. What kind of tertiary text they produce is largely dependent on these limitations and not least how people interact through the comments. In other words the setting and framing of this production is vital. The site allows for interaction between the different kinds of users, and with the hope of creating stronger ties to the readers (as we saw earlier), there seem to be a need for communities on the site. But communities are something that is generated over time and not just because the possibilities are there. It takes time and effort to develop communities online (cf. online games where the facilitation of communities is highly prioritized). At the same time online communities often suffer from spam and flaming. A further research of the site would benefit from looking at how these kinds of sites are setup. How they facilitate the right kind of text

\[\text{Figure 2. Reconfiguring the book.}\]

\[61\text{ Cf. Fiske, p. 101ff.}\]
production in order to create communities dedicated to developing the site and the discussions found on it. Green seemed to believe that once the site was up and operating the user-generated content would more or less appear by itself. Green even pointed out that they did not promote the site itself in anyway. This viewpoint seems close to naïve. There are many cases of social media marketing going bad, because the companies did not plan how to use and relate to these media.\textsuperscript{62} If Gyldendal are to be successful with their site, and not end up like several others this is what the next steps needs to be centered around.

\textsuperscript{62} As an example see the Honda Crosstour case: http://tinyurl.com/lbbvwh
Conclusion

In this paper we have examined how Gyldendal uses the website gyldendal.dk to promote books and authors. We have done this by interviewing a key developer of the company along with observations on the website. The data collected have been analyzed and we used theories about two-step flow, user generated media, uses and gratification and elaboration likelihood model to understand this material.

User generated content is still only used at a small scale on the site. However, Gyldendal has big ideas about creating author forums where authors can upload and manage their own site within the overall site of gyldendal.dk as well as user profiles which allows for tracking and following of one particular person. Yet, at this point gyldendal.dk has only incorporated user generated content in form of commentary threads and rating opportunities on books. Gyldendal offers authors the possibility to promote their books by creating attention about it through the use of commentaries. The authors get gratification through this as they are able to prolong the life of their book by being active on the site. At the same time the authors are themselves promoted through their presence at the site. This works as the readers get gratification through their interaction with the author and other readers. Thereby Gyldendal is changing the relationship people have with the book. The book becomes the mean to a contact with the author. As such the books receive significant promotion as attention is created around the authors and their books.

Our findings indicate that Gyldendal use the website to prolong the lifespan of the books, thus promoting the books and authors. We have seen that Gyldendal use user interaction to create stronger ties with the readers and to some extend also the authors. By creating a site only focused on books and authors Gyldendal is trying to give new life to books in the eyes of the reader. If this is successful it is still too early to conclude, but thinking in terms of bonus material the book as a social object is reconfigured.
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