Digital Diplomacy 2.0? A cross-national comparison of public engagement in Facebook and Twitter

Ronit Kampf, Phd

Ilan Manor

Elad Segev, Phd

Contact details: manor.ilan@gmail.com

Digital Diplomacy 2.0?
A Cross-national Comparison of Public Engagement in Facebook and Twitter

Ronit Kampf
Department of Communication, Naftali Building, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv 6997801, Israel
ronitka@post.tau.ac.il

Ilan Manor
Department of Communication, Naftali Building, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv 6997801, Israel
ilanman1@post.tau.ac.il

Elad Segev
Department of Communication, Naftali Building, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv 6997801, Israel
eladseg@tau.ac.il

Summary

Social media holds the potential to foster dialogue between nations and foreign populations. Yet only a few studies to date have investigated the manner in which digital diplomacy is practised by foreign ministries. Using Kent and Taylor's framework for dialogic communication, this article explores the extent to which dialogic communication is adopted by foreign ministries in terms of content, media channels and public engagement. The results of a six-week analysis of content published on Twitter and Facebook by eleven foreign ministries show that engagement and dialogic communication are rare. When engagement does occur, it is quarantined to specific issues. Social media content published by foreign ministries represents a continuous supply of press releases targeting foreign, rather than domestic, populations. A cross-national comparison revealed no discernible differences in the adoption of dialogic principles. Results therefore indicate that foreign ministries still fail to realize the potential of digital diplomacy to foster dialogue.

Keywords

Digital diplomacy, public diplomacy, dialogic communication, public engagement, social networking sites, web 2.0.

Introduction

In a world where power and influence truly belongs to the many, we must engage with more people in more places. […] People all around the world are clamoring to be heard. […] They are having important conversations rights now […] and they aren't waiting for us.[1]

---

[1] Quoted in Craig Hayden, 'Social Media at State: Power, Practice and Conceptual Limits for US Public Diplomacy?', *Global Media Journal — American Edition*, vol. 11, no. 21 (2012), pp. 1–15.

Ministries of foreign affairs (MFAs), embassies and diplomats throughout the world have recently flocked to social networking sites (SNS) such as Twitter and Facebook in a practice that is generally referred to as digital diplomacy. According to the Twiplomacy website, there are now 228 MFAs and foreign ministers active on Twitter, in addition to some 400 heads of state and more than 200 missions to UN Institutions.[2]

The incorporation of SNS in the conduct of diplomacy enables MFAs to foster dialogue with their social media followers, thereby creating long-lasting relationships with them. Such relationships may, in turn, facilitate the acceptance of a nation's foreign policy among foreign populations. Moreover, dialogue enables MFAs to understand better the needs of different audiences and to tailor their messages more effectively. Digital diplomacy could thus represent a conceptual shift in the practice of diplomacy, in which MFAs adopt dialogic models of communication as opposed to monologic ones.[3] This article therefore offers the definition of digital diplomacy as the use of SNS in order to foster dialogue with online publics.

Despite growing interest in digital diplomacy, few studies to date have investigated the manner in which MFAs practise this novel form of diplomacy in terms of content shared with followers, use of different media (that is, Twitter or Facebook, etc.) and scope of activity. Even fewer studies have explored whether MFAs have in fact adopted dialogic communication models engaging their followers in two-way exchanges of information. This article aims to address these two gaps. Using a sample of eleven MFAs from around the world (Ethiopia, India, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Poland, Rwanda, Somalia, South Korea, the United States and the United Kingdom), the authors investigated the manner in which digital diplomacy is practised *de facto* in the field, and the extent to which MFAs now use SNS to foster dialogic relations with online followers. This was achieved by employing Kent and Taylor's framework for dialogic communication.

Literature Review

The Potential for Public Engagement Online

In their seminal paper, Michael Kent and Maureen Taylor describe the web's potential to foster dialogic communication based on an exchange of opinions and ideas between organizations and the public. Dialogic communication is understood to be the product of two-way symmetrical communication.[4]

Kent and Taylor count five principles that are necessary in order to develop a strategic framework for web-based relationships. The first is dialogic loop, which enables the public to query organizations as well as enabling organizations to address the public's questions and concerns. Dialogic loop requires a commitment of resources from the organization and training of public relations' practitioners, who must abandon traditional broadcast models of communication.

The second principle, deriving from the first, deals with the usefulness of information provided by organizations, which should be relevant to the general public. Dialogic communication may only be achieved once visitors come to rely on a website's useful and trustworthy information. Creating relationships is achieved through addressing the interests and concerns of various publics.

The third principle focuses on generating return visits to a website, which may be achieved by continuously updating information, tailoring information to the public's needs, and hosting question and answer (Q&A) forums with experts. Such forums utilize the

[2] Available online at https://Twitter.com/Twiplomacy/lists.
[3] Hayden, 'Social Media at State', p. 3; and James Pamment, *New Public Diplomacy in the Twenty-first Century: A Comparative Study of Policy and Practice* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), p. 3.
[4] Michael L. Kent and Maureen Taylor, 'Building Dialogic Relationships through the World Wide Web', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 3, no. 24 (1998), pp. 321–334; and James E. Grunig and Todd Hunt, *Managing Public Relations* (New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1984).

interactive nature of the internet and represent a shift from broadcast models. Moreover, information enables the public to engage with the organization as an informed partner.

The fourth principle refers to the interface usability. In 1998, Kent and Taylor emphasized easy navigation and textual rather than graphic online content.

The final principle, conservation of visitors, calls on organizations to avoid posting links that drive visitors away without providing the ability to return.

Since the publication of Kent and Taylor's framework, additional channels for dialogic communication have emerged in the forms of social media tools (such as Wikis and blogs) and SNS. Social media may be defined as a set of online tools that are centred on social interaction and facilitate two-way communication.[5] SNS, in particular, may provide ideal conditions for dialogic communication, as organizations can communicate with individuals on topics of shared interest.[6] SNS are defined as:

> […] networked communication platforms in which participants 1) have uniquely identifiable profiles that consist of user-supplied content, content provided by other users, and/or system-provided data; 2) can publicly articulate connections that can be viewed and traversed by others; and 3) can consume, produce, and/or interact with streams of user-generated content provided by their connections on the site.[7]

Despite the evolution in online tools for fostering dialogue, Kent and Taylor's framework remains relevant. Numerous contemporary studies have employed this framework when investigating the use of online tools (such as blogs and SNS) to facilitate dialogic communication between organizations and publics.[8] The majority of such studies have found that organizations have yet to realize fully the web's dialogic potential.[9] For instance, Denise Bortree and Trent Seltzer's study from 2009 evaluated the dialogic principles utilized by environmental advocacy groups on Facebook. Similarly, Ebru Uzunoğlu and Sema Kip found in 2014 that Turkish non-profit organizations' websites failed to meet the requirements of dialogic communication outlined by Kent and Taylor.[10] In 2010, Svetlana Rybalko and Trent Seltzer adapted Kent and Taylor's principles for the age of SNS. They argued that a company's various SNS profiles should all be considered part of one extended social

---

[5] For definitions of social media, see Gwanhoo Lee and Young H. Kwak, 'An Open Government Maturity Model for Social Media-based Public Engagement', *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 4 (2012), pp. 492–503; and Brian G. Smith, 'Socially Distributing Public Relations: Twitter, Haiti, and Interactivity in Social Media', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 36, no. 4 (2010), pp. 329–335.

[6] Denise S. Bortree and Trent Seltzer, 'Dialogic Strategies and Outcomes: An Analysis of Environmental Advocacy Groups' Facebook Profiles', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 35, no. 3 (2009), pp. 317–319.

[7] Quoted from Nicole N. Ellison and Danah M. Boyd, 'Sociality through Social Network Sites', in William H. Dutton (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Internet Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 151–172.

[8] For examples, see Rowena L. Briones, Beth Kuch, Brooke Fisher Liu and Yan Jin, 'Keeping Up with the Digital Age: How the American Red Cross Uses Social Media to Build Relationships', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 37, no. 1 (2011), pp. 37–43; Tom Kelleher, 'Conversational Voice, Communicated Commitment, and Public Relations Outcomes in Interactive Online Communication', *Journal of Communication*, vol. 59, no. 1 (2009), pp. 172–188; Hyojung Park and Brian H. Reber, 'Relationship Building and the Use of Web Sites: How Fortune 500 Corporations use their Web Sites to Build Relationships', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 34, no. 4 (2008), pp. 409–411; Trent Seltzer and Michael A. Mitrook, 'The Dialogic Potential of Weblogs in Relationship Building', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 3, no. 2 (2007), pp. 227–229; Linjuan R. Men and Wan-Hsiu S. Tsai, 'How Companies Cultivate Relationships with Publics on Social Network Sites: Evidence from China and the United States', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 38, no. 5 (2012), pp. 723–730.

[9] For further review, see Bortree and Seltzer, 'Dialogic Strategies and Outcomes', p. 318; Erich J. Sommerfeldts, Michael L. Kent and Maureen Taylor, 'Activist Practitioner Perspectives of Website Public Relations: Why Aren't Activist Websites Fulfilling the Dialogic Promise?', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 38, no. 2 (2012), pp. 303–312; Kaye D. Sweetser and Ruthann W. Lariscy, 'Candidates Make Good Friends: An Analysis of Candidates' Uses of Facebook', *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, vol. 2, no. 3 (2008), pp. 175–198; and Donald K. Wright and Michelle Drifka Hinson, 'Examining how Social and Emerging Media have been Used in Public Relations between 2006 and 2012: A Longitudinal Analysis', available online at http://test.prsa.org/Intelligence/PRJournal/Documents/2012WrightHinson.pdf.

[10] Ebru Uzunoğlu and Sema M. Kip, 'Building Relationships through Websites: A Content Analysis of Turkish Environmental Non-profit Organizations' Websites', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 40, no. 1 (2014), pp. 113–115.

networking presence. Links between SNS profiles may thus be regarded as part of the principle of conservation of visitors.[11]

While public relations studies have focused on both Facebook and Twitter, there are important differences between the two. Twitter is considered a micro-blogging service and — unlike Facebook — reciprocity is not a prerequisite for information-sharing on Twitter. Thus, while Facebook may be used for sharing personal information and social interaction, Twitter is a medium for information and opinion-sharing.[12] This difference is manifest in the questions posed to users who log on to both SNS. While on Facebook one is asked 'What's on your mind?', on Twitter one is asked 'What's happening?' Finally, while Facebook has long since enabled users to integrate video and images into their feeds, this is a relatively new feature on Twitter.[13]

Governments and Public Engagement

Over the past decade, governments have also embraced social media.[14] Incorporating social media into government online activities holds numerous benefits, such as increasing citizen's accessibility to government services and providing citizens with opportunities to engage in public debate.[15] Social media may also reduce the cost of political participation. Jim Macnamara, Phyllis Sakinofsky and Jenni Beattie argue that in an age marked by declining citizen interest and participation in democratic processes, governments aim to use social media in order to re-engage citizens and to reinvigorate the public sphere.[16]

Yet when evaluating E-government initiatives, Brian Dixon found that although government websites include a breadth of information, most have not realized the potential for two-way communication to engage the national citizenry.[17] Kathleen McNutt argues that a government's ability to adapt to the digital age depends on the organizational willingness to shift public engagement activities from the web 1.0 'broadcast paradigm' to the web 2.0 'communicative paradigm'. McNutt uses the term Government 2.0 in reference to the embracing of a web 2.0 ethos comprised of the following elements: transparency;

---

[11] Svetlana Rybalko and Trent Seltzer, 'Dialogic Communication in 140 Characters or Less: How Fortune 500 Companies Engage Stakeholders using Twitter', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 36, no. 4 (2010), pp. 336–341.

[12] For further discussion on differences between SNS, see David J. Hughes, Moss Rowe and Andre Lee, 'A Tale of Two Sites: Twitter vs. Facebook and the Personality Predictors of Social Media Usage', *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 28, no. 2 (2012), pp. 561–569; Haewoon Kwak, Changhyun Lee, Hosung Park and Sue Moon, 'What is Twitter, a Social Network or a News Media?', in *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on the World Wide Web* (2010), pp. 591–600; and Bernardo A. Huberman, Daniel M. Romero and Fang Wu, 'Social Networks that Matter: Twitter under the Microscope', *First Monday*, vol. 14, no.1 (2009).

[13] Twitter Blog, 'Picture This: More Visual Tweets' (29 October 2013), available online at https://blog.Twitter.com/2013/picture-this-more-visual-tweets.

[14] See Brian E. Dixon, 'Towards E-government 2.0: An Assessment of Where E-government 2.0 Is and Where it is Headed', *Public Administration & Management*, vol. 15, no. 2 (2010), pp. 418–454; Kathleen McNutt, 'Public Engagement in the Web 2.0 Era: Social Collaborative Technologies in a Public Sector Context', *Canadian Public Administration*, vol. 57, no. 1 (2014), pp. 49–70; and Diego D. Navarra and Tony Cornford, 'The State and Democracy after New Public Management: Exploring Alternative Models of E-governance', *The Information Society*, vol. 28, no. 1 (2012), pp. 37–45.

[15] For further review, see Lemuria Carte and France Bélanger, 'The Utilization of E-government Services: Citizen Trust, Innovation and Acceptance Factors', *Information Systems Journal*, vol. 15, no. 1 (2005), pp. 5–25 ; Smith, 'Socially Distributing Public Relations', p. 330; and Julia K. Woolley, Anthony M. Limperos and Mary B. Olive, 'The 2008 Presidential Election, 2.0: A Content Analysis of User-generated Political Facebook Groups', *Mass Communication and Society*, vol. 13, no. 5 (2010), pp. 631–652.

[16] For further discussion, see Natalie Fenton, 'The Internet and Social Networking', in James Curran, Natalie Fenton and Des Freedman, *Misunderstanding the Internet* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2012), pp. 123–148; Jim Macnamara, Phyllis Sakinofsky and Jenni Beattie, 'E-electoral Engagement: How Governments Use Social Media to Engage Voters', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 47, no. 4 (2012), pp. 623–639; and Jim Macnamara, 'Pre- and Post-election 2010 Online: What Happened to the Conversation?', *Communication, Politics, Culture*, vol. 44, no. 2 (2011), pp. 18–36.

[17] Dixon, 'Towards E-government 2.0', p. 440.

participatory opportunities (such as crowd-sourcing); co-production; collaboration; and openness.[18]

Diplomacy and Public Engagement

Unlike other government branches, MFAs are relative newcomers to social media. However, diplomacy is no stranger to public engagement. Indeed, William Roberts defines public diplomacy as foreign policy activities that are aimed at creating a positive climate among foreign publics in order to facilitate the acceptance of another country's foreign policy.[19] Nicholas Cull adds to this definition, asserting that the term 'public diplomacy' refers to the process by which international actors seek to accomplish their foreign policy goals by engaging with foreign publics.[20] Accordingly, the use of social media by MFAs may be viewed as a novel tool for public engagement in diplomacy.

However, it is also possible that digital diplomacy may constitute a new form of public diplomacy. According to Craig Hayden, governments are now in need of a 'new' public diplomacy that contends with a global media ecology characterized by a fragmentation of audiences to networks of selective exposure. In this media ecology, the goal of public diplomacy is transformed from the transmission of information to the building and leveraging of long-lasting relationships with foreign publics.[21]

Similarly, James Pamment maintains that two-way communication is the very essence of the new public diplomacy. Pamment argues that twentieth-century public diplomacy was characterized by a one-way flow of information in which there was limited interaction between communicator and recipient. The emergence of a new media landscape, consisting of a continuous global flow of information, necessitates new tools for communicating public diplomacy to international audiences. The new public diplomacy thus represents a clear break from the one-way broadcasting model of public diplomacy while taking advantage of social media to establish two-way engagement with publics.[22]

Given the potential of SNS to foster dialogue and two-way symmetrical communications with online publics, digital diplomacy may be the very manifestation of the new public diplomacy. Yet while public diplomacy has traditionally targeted foreign populations, digital diplomacy may also target domestic populations. Such is the case with US State Department tweets that emphasize the impact of a trade agreement on domestic unemployment rates, or with tweets published by Kenya's foreign ministry regarding the emergency evacuation of citizens from South Sudan following the outbreak of internal fighting.[23]

In her statement quoted at the beginning of this article, US Under-Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs Judith McHale emphasized two components of digital diplomacy: engagement; and listening. These two components represent the fundamental difference between public diplomacy, which is characterized by monologue, and digital diplomacy, which is characterized by dialogue.[24] Engagement, according to Emily Metzgar, refers to the need to communicate with publics that are assembled in various online networks. The acceptance of engagement as a crucial component of digital diplomacy means that one cannot measure the effectiveness of digital diplomacy by the number of 'likes' on an embassy's Facebook profile, but rather, one must examine the volume of dialogue between

---

[18] McNutt, 'Public Engagement in the Web 2.0 Era', p. 50; and Paul Henman, 'Governmentalities of Gov 2.0', *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 16, no. 9 (2013), pp. 1397–1418.
[19] William R. Roberts, 'What is Public Diplomacy? Past Practices, Present Conduct, Possible Future', *Mediterranean Quarterly,* vol. 18, no. 4 (2007), pp. 36–53.
[20] Nicholas J. Cull, 'Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories', *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 616, no. 1 (2008), pp. 31–54.
[21] Hayden, 'Social Media at State', p. 3.
[22] Pamment, *New Public Diplomacy in the Twenty-first Century*, p. 3.
[23] For example, see online at https://Twitter.com/StateDept/status/600788465333198848; and https://Twitter.com/interiorke/status/416456837454913536.
[24] Hayden, 'Social Media at State', p. 3.

the embassy and its followers. Listening refers to the use of SNS in order to understand foreign publics and shape foreign policy accordingly.[25]

The aforementioned arguments reveal that digital diplomacy may indeed constitute a novel form of dialogic diplomacy. However, Heewoon Cha, Sunha Yeo and Bittnari Kim recently evaluated the dialogic nature of websites and blogs that are operated by foreign embassies in South Korea. Using Kent and Taylor's framework, they found that most embassies fail to meet the dialogic potential of social media and are passive in their communication with online publics. This analysis demonstrates the applicability of Kent and Taylor's framework to the study of public diplomacy.[26]

With the exception of Cha *et al.*, however, the digital diplomacy research corpus is currently characterized by an abundance of papers exploring its potential and a lack of empiric research aimed at investigating its current practice. Likewise, there is a need to evaluate the manner in which each channel of digital diplomacy (that is, Twitter or Facebook, etc.) is used to advance its practice. Therefore, the assessment of digital diplomacy calls for an exploration of the channels by which this form of diplomacy is conducted and an evaluation of whether MFAs have adopted dialogic principles when communicating with online publics.

Research Question and Hypotheses

This article explores the extent to which MFAs have realized the potential of digital diplomacy to foster dialogic relations with online publics through the principles introduced by Kent and Taylor. We maintain that Kent and Taylor's dialogic principles form an appropriate framework for this study given their continued use in current public relations studies, their emphasis on content analysis, which was the main methodology employed in this study, and their recent use in evaluating the dialogic communication of diplomatic institutions.

Given that SNS users are familiar with the online environment in which digital diplomacy is practised (whether Facebook or Twitter), the authors did not evaluate the principle of conservation of return visits. Likewise, they did not evaluate the principle of ease of interface, given that multimedia, and not necessarily text, is what drives SNS profiles nowadays. This study therefore focused on three dialogic principles: dialogic loop; generating return visits; and the usefulness of information.

RQ: To what extent have MFAs adopted the dialogic loop, generating return visits and the usefulness of information principles?

Dialogic Loop
H1: MFAs will actively engage followers on both Twitter and Facebook
Given that the potential of digital diplomacy lies in fostering dialogue with followers, the authors assumed that MFAs would actively engage publics on both channels. Engagement was defined as all instances in which MFAs interact directly with their followers (for example, answering questions, responding to criticism and supplying requested information).

Generating Return Visits
H2: The volume of MFA activity on Twitter channels would be greater than the volume of activity on Facebook
We assumed that MFAs would be more active on Twitter because (a) tweets enable governments to share information and comment immediately on world affairs without having

[25] Emily T. Metzgar, 'Is it the Medium or the Message: Social Media, American Public Diplomacy and Iran', *Global Media Journal — American Edition*, vol. 11, no. 21 (2012), pp. 3–5.
[26] Heewoon Cha, Sunha Yeo and Bittnari Kim, 'Social Media's Dialogic Communication of Foreign Embassies in Korea and Public Diplomacy: Based on Dialogic Communication Theory', *Advanced Science and Technology Letters*, vol. 63 (2014), pp. 175–178.

to draft lengthy foreign policy statements; and (b) MFAs would require several tweets in order to address fully a complex issue, given Twitter's 140 character limit.

H3: The percentage of tweets including multimedia would be smaller than that of Facebook posts

By multimedia, the authors refer to the use of images and videos. Facebook was expected to display a greater multimedia variety than Twitter, because a) the incorporation of multimedia in one's feed is a relatively novel feature in Twitter as opposed to Facebook; and b) MFAs would not go to the trouble of finding relevant media to accommodate each tweet.

H4: MFAs would publish different content on each SNS profile

Like Rybalko and Seltzer,[27] the authors assert that Facebook profiles and Twitter channels should all be considered part of an MFA's online presence. As Pew's latest study indicates, the majority of social media followers now use more than one SNS on a regular basis.[28] We therefore assumed that in order to generate return visits to both their Twitter and Facebook profiles, MFAs would avoid publishing similar content on both channels, as such duplication might drive away followers seeking different information and interaction on each SNS.

Usefulness of Information

H5: MFAs' tweets would deal more with foreign issues than with domestic ones, whereas MFAs' Facebook posts would deal more with domestic issues

Kent and Taylor assert that usefulness of information is achieved by publishing content that addresses the interests and concerns of various publics. The authors assumed that MFAs would publish content that is relevant to both foreign and domestic publics on their SNS profiles. This stemmed from a) our view of digital diplomacy as part of the evolution of E-government, in which nation-states interact with their own citizenry; and b) an analysis of tweets published by MFAs following the outbreak of violence in South Sudan in 2013. A feasibility study conducted in August 2013 examined the languages used on Facebook and Twitter by 85 MFAs throughout the world (see Appendix 1). Results indicated that the majority of MFAs use English on Twitter, while reverting to local languages on Facebook. Following these results, the authors assumed that Twitter channels are directed towards international audiences, while Facebook profiles are directed towards domestic audiences and dealing with the impact of foreign policy issues on the domestic population.[29]

Methodology

Sample

The sample included eleven MFAs from the following countries: Ethiopia; India; Israel; Japan; Kenya; Poland; Rwanda; Somalia; South Korea; the United Kingdom; and the United States. Countries in the sample were selected because of a desire to explore MFAs of various geographic locations and cultures, levels of economic prosperity, and different diffusions and use of information and communication technologies.[30] They were also selected because of their extensive use of SNS, which provided sufficient data for content analysis.

---

[27] Rybalko and Seltzer, 'Dialogic Communication in 140 Characters or Less', p. 338.
[28] Pew Research Center, 'Social Media Update 2014' (9 June 2015), available online at http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014/.
[29] 27 countries in the sample tweeted in English, although English was not their official language. Of these 27 countries, 56 per cent reverted to their local language on their Facebook profiles.
[30] Martin Hilbert, 'The End Justifies the Definition: The Manifold Outlooks on the Digital Divide and their Practical Usefulness for Policy-making', *Telecommunications Policy*, vol. 35, no. 8 (2011), pp. 715–736.

Procedure

The authors analysed all content published by the aforementioned MFAs on their official Twitter channels and Facebook pages over two time intervals, each lasting 21 days (for the list of SNS accounts, see Appendix 2). The first time interval spanned from 1 to 21 December 2013, and the second interval spanned from 4 to 24 March 2014. Notably, these two intervals were separated by a major world event — the annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation.[31] During the second time interval, Israel was excluded from the sample because of an MFA strike, which resulted in little social media activity

The Twitter channels and Facebook profiles of all eleven MFAs were visited on a daily basis. During such visits, all tweets and posts published during the previous 24 hours were collected and recorded by capturing screenshots. This method was employed because of the concern that MFAs might delete certain tweets or posts for various reasons. The Archivedbook desktop online application and the Twitter Timemachine desktop online application[32] were used in order to ensure that the research corpus included all of the content published by the MFAs in the sample. Finally, in order to ensure collection of all Facebook posts, both an Israeli and US IP address were used to access all of the MFA profiles. No difference in Facebook content was observed during this evaluation. Overall, 2,689 tweets and 954 Facebook posts were analyzed as part of this study.

Measures

Dialogic Loop: MFA–public engagement was investigated by recording all of the instances in which MFAs actively engaged with SNS followers. In addition, the authors analysed the percentage of tweets and posts that included invitations to engage with MFAs at predefined times regarding predefined issues (for example, an invitation from the US State Department to a Google hangout dealing with disability rights).

Generating Return Visits: This study hypothesized that the publication of duplicate content on Twitter and Facebook would drive visitors away. The publication of different content on Twitter and Facebook was investigated through the congruence parameter, which calculated the percentage of tweets published by each MFA that were also published as Facebook posts.

Usefulness of Information: Investigating the target audiences of MFA tweets and posts was achieved by using a codebook constructed specifically for this study. Through this codebook, all SNS content was classified into two categories: content aimed at foreign or domestic populations. This classification was made possible by posing the following question to coders: 'Is the information in the tweet/post relevant only to the citizens of a given country (for example, UK government plans for a new small business loan initiative)?' If this was the case, then the tweet or post would be categorized as dealing with domestic issues. In all other instances, the tweet or post would have been categorized as dealing with foreign issues.

Next, given a desire to examine the extent to which MFAs publish content that is relevant to diverse audiences, the codebook was used to classify SNS content into the following topical categories (see Appendix 3 for examples of each category): bilateral; multilateral; a tweet directed at another world leader; diaspora; strategic partnerships; global initiatives; a particular country in global initiatives; the military; national security; the safety of citizens abroad; the economy; tourism; trade; foreign aid and the receipt of foreign aid; engagement and an invitation to engage; an invitation to read/watch; congratulations; cultural, scientific, history or MFA-related news; appointments; state visits; and current affairs.

---

[31] David M. Herszenhorn, 'In Crimea, Russia Moved to Throw Off the Cloak of Defeat', *The New York Times* (24 March 2014).

[32] Available online at http://archivedbook.com/; and at http://www.twimemachine.com/.

The topical categories comprising the codebook were derived from the research corpus itself through the process of thematic analysis as defined by Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke as 'a method for identifying, analysing and reporting on patterns, or themes, within a given data corpus'.[33] First, half of all of the content published by the MFAs in the sample was reviewed. Once this had been completed, initial categories into which the entire research corpus would later be categorized were created. Next, one-third of all of the content published by the sample was reviewed in order to ensure the relevance of the identified categories and to explore the need for additional categories. Finally, a codebook was created, enabling coders to classify all of the content into topical categories.

Two coders were trained in using the codebook. Based on 45 tweets and 45 Facebook posts, the percentage of agreement and kappa values for each category were: foreign issues/domestic issues (kappa=0.62, agreement=90%); relations with other nations (including bilateral and multilateral) (kappa=0.69, agreement=84%); national achievements (including the categories of culture and scientific) (kappa=0.93, agreement=99%); current affairs (kappa=0.66, agreement=92%); economy (including economy–trade and economy–tourism) (kappa=0.78, agreement=93%); invitations to engage (kappa=0.66, agreement=91%); and state visits (kappa=0.92, agreement=98%).

Finally, following McNutt's government 2.0 concept (from 2012), the authors explored the degree to which MFAs have adopted a web 2.0 ethos as part of their migration to web 2.0 applications. The authors recorded all instances in which MFAs published user-generated content, thereby enabling collaboration, instances in which MFAs crowd-sourced their followers (for example, posing a question or asking for solutions to problems), and instances in which MFAs offered their followers participatory opportunities (such as participating in a photo competition). This analysis was limited to SNS content published during the second interval only.

Statistical Procedure

Generating Return Visits: The Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used to compare the MFAs' volume of activity in each SNS (Twitter or Facebook), as well as the percentage of tweets and posts that included multimedia.

Usefulness of Information: The Chi Square Test was used to compare the prevalence of topical categories between mediums (Twitter or Facebook) and between time intervals.

Results

Dialogic Loop: During the first time interval, occurrences of engagement with followers were recorded in only three MFAs: Israel (69 occurrences on Twitter and 5 on Facebook); Kenya (23 on Twitter and 9 on Facebook); and the United States (9 on Facebook). However, the occurrences observed on the Israeli MFA's Twitter channel were all part of one Q&A session held with the MFA's spokesperson, and may thus be regarded as an outlier. During the second time interval, occurrences of engagement with followers were identified in five MFAs: the United States (46 on Facebook); Kenya (10 on Twitter and 6 on Facebook); the United Kingdom (6 on Twitter); India (6 on Twitter and 9 on Facebook); and Poland (1 on Facebook). However, 44 of the occurrences of engagement found on the US State Department's Facebook profile were all part of one Q&A session and should thus also be regarded as an outlier. Given these results, H4 was rejected — that is, engagement with MFA followers seems to be a rarity and represents a minute fraction of overall MFA activity on SNS.

---

[33] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke, 'Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2 (2006), pp. 77–101.

During the first time interval, invitations to engage with MFAs at predefined times regarding predefined issues were published by seven MFAs. The percentages of tweets and posts that included such invitations were: India (16.5 per cent of tweets); Israel (5 per cent of tweets and 6 per cent of posts); the United States (13.4 per cent of tweets and 3.6 per cent of posts); Somalia (2.7 per cent of tweets); the United Kingdom (2.6 per cent of tweets); Kenya (1.9 per cent of tweets and 1.4 per cent of posts); and Poland (0.6 per cent of tweets and 4.3 per cent of posts). During the second time interval, invitations to engage were published by seven MFAs. The percentages of tweets and posts that included such invitations were: Somalia (10.5 per cent of tweets); Rwanda (6.6 per cent of tweets); the United States (4.6 per cent of tweets and 16.9 per cent of posts); the United Kingdom (2.2 per cent of tweets and 4.3 per cent of posts); India (1.6 per cent of tweets and 0.5 per cent of posts); and Ethiopia (0.7 per cent of tweets and 7.1 per cent of posts). While invitations to engage with MFAs were more common than actual engagement, they also represent a small percentage of overall MFA activity.

Generating Return Visits: During the first time interval, in nine out of the eleven countries in the sample the average number of daily tweets was larger than the average number of daily Facebook posts (see Table 1 below). Overall, the daily average number of tweets was 5.73 as opposed to 2.13 Facebook posts. This difference is statistically significant (one-sided p value=0.014, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test). During the second time interval, in six out of ten countries the average number of daily tweets was larger than the average number of daily Facebook posts. Overall, the daily average number of tweets was 6.43 as opposed to 2.2 Facebook posts. This difference is also statistically significant (one-sided p value=0.03, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test). There was no statistically significant difference in the volume of activity on Twitter between the first and second time intervals. Similar results were obtained for Facebook (two-sided p value=0.6, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test). Given these results, H1 was confirmed — that is, MFAs use Twitter significantly more than Facebook.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

During the first time interval, the majority of Facebook posts included multimedia (that is, images and video), as opposed to a smaller fraction of tweets. Overall, 72 per cent of Facebook posts included multimedia, as opposed to only 14 per cent of tweets. This difference is statistically significant (one-sided p value =0.008, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test). Similar results were observed during the second time interval as overall 68.4 per cent of Facebook posts included multimedia, as opposed to 22 per cent of tweets. This difference was also statistically significant (one-sided p value =0.01, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test). There was no statistically significant difference between the first and second time intervals (two-sided p value =0.44, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test). Given these results, H2 was confirmed — that is, MFAs use multimedia in Facebook significantly more than in Twitter.

The congruence analysis revealed that the majority of MFAs publish identical content on both their Twitter channels and Facebook profiles. During the first time interval, seven of the eleven MFAs that were evaluated received a congruence score of between 55 and 100 per cent (see Table 2 below). During the second time interval, seven of the nine MFAs evaluated received a congruence score of between 50 and 80 per cent. Given these results, H3 was rejected — that is, the content that MFAs publish on their official Twitter and Facebook accounts is largely identical.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Usefulness of Information: During the first time interval, the vast majority of tweets and Facebook posts published by all of the MFAs dealt primarily with foreign issues, with the exception of Somalia (see Table 3 below). Domestic issues represented less than 50 per cent of the overall tweets and Facebook posts in nine out of the eleven countries. On average, 81 per cent of all tweets and 82 per cent of all posts dealt with foreign issues. Similar results were observed during the second time interval as domestic issues represented less than 50 per cent of the overall tweets and Facebook posts in nine out of ten countries, again with the exception of Somalia. On average, 92 per cent of all tweets and 80 per cent of all posts dealt with foreign issues. Given these results, H5 was rejected — that is, the vast majority of MFA content on both Twitter and Facebook was targeted at foreign populations.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

In order to compare SNS content published on Twitter and Facebook, the 26 categories were grouped into the following eight categories: relations with other nations; soft power; hard power; engagement with followers; national achievements; economic; diplomacy; and current affairs (see Appendix 3).

[Insert Table 4 about here]

During the first time interval, there was no significant difference in category prevalence between Twitter and Facebook (two-sided Chi square P value=0.063). However, the second period saw a significant difference in category prevalence between both media (two-sided Chi square P value=0.002). When comparing category prevalence in Twitter between both time intervals, there was a statistically significant difference (two-sided Chi square, P <0.001). Similarly, when comparing category prevalence on Facebook between both time intervals, there was a statistically significant difference (two-sided Chi square, P <0.001). (See Appendix 4 for the prevalence of each of the 26 topical categories during both time intervals in each medium).

Web 2.0 Ethos: After reviewing all SNS content published by the MFAs in the sample during the second time interval, the authors recorded only one occurrence of crowd-sourcing, three occurrences of the use of user-generated content, and two occurrences of participatory opportunities.

Conclusion

Public diplomacy scholars have argued that the incorporation of social media into the practice of diplomacy may constitute a new form of diplomacy that enables nations to create, and leverage, long-term relationships with foreign populations.[34] As social media is centred on social interaction, facilitating two-way communication, digital diplomacy may be

---

[34] See, for example, Hayden, 'Social Media at State', p. 3; and Geoffrey Cowan and Amelia Arsenault, 'Moving from Monologue to Dialogue to Collaboration: The Three Layers of Public Diplomacy', *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 616, no. 1 (March 2008), pp. 10–30.

characterized by dialogue, as opposed to traditional public diplomacy which was characterized by monologue.[35] While digital diplomacy has attracted scholarly work for several years, little empirical work has been undertaken to characterize its current practice or to evaluate whether its dialogic potential has been realized. This study addressed these gaps through Kent and Taylor's framework for dialogic communication. By evaluating SNS content published by eleven foreign ministries over a six-week period, the authors endeavoured to assess the degree to which the dialogic loop, generating return visits and the usefulness of information principles, as established by Kent and Taylor, have been adopted by MFAs.

The results of the dialogic loop principle indicate that engagement between MFAs and their online followers is a rarity. Across all of the MFAs in our sample, occurrences of engagement were scarce and represented a small fraction of the overall activity. Our results demonstrate a substantial gap between the relationship goals of MFAs and their actual dialogic engagement,[36] as is often the case with non-profit organizations. Results also indicate that when engagement does occur, it is in the form of Q&A sessions that are limited to predefined issues. Throughout the study, only one instance of open MFA–public engagement was found, in the form of a live Q&A session with the Israeli MFA's spokesperson. Based on these results, this article argues that MFAs have essentially quarantined their engagement with followers. The overall failure to meet the dialogic potential of SNS by MFAs is the most important finding of this study, as it suggests that MFAs have yet to abandon broadcast models of communication in diplomacy.

The authors were especially surprised by the lack of engagement with followers during the second time interval, which saw an escalation in the Crimean crisis. They expected the United States and the United Kingdom, as leading members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), to use SNS in order to engage with their audiences and explain their policies towards Russia. Similarly, Poland — Russia's neighbour and former member of the Soviet Block — was expected to use SNS in order to rally international condemnation of Russia. However, occurrences of engagement remained low during this time interval. Even more important was the finding that none of the MFAs invited their followers to Q&A sessions dedicated to this escalating crisis.

There may be several explanations for the lack of engagement observed in this study. As Cha *et al*. argue, resources may serve as a main barrier to dialogic communication by diplomatic institutions.[37] Likewise, government culture, which is risk averse, may also constitute a barrier to social media adoption, as it requires relinquishing control over the communication process. Finally, MFAs may yet have to formulate guidelines and offer the necessary training for social media engagement.[38]

It is, however, important to note that the few instances of engagement observed in this study demonstrate the potential of digital diplomacy. For instance, during the first time interval, Kenya's MFA supplied information to its SNS followers regarding the evacuation of Kenyan citizens from South Sudan once internal fighting broke out in the country. Consular assistance via SNS was also observed on India's Twitter channel during the second time interval. These examples demonstrate the potential of digital diplomacy to assist a nation's population in times of crisis.

Interestingly, Kenya's MFA exhibited engagement with followers during both time intervals. Likewise, African MFAs in our sample were found to be among the most active on SNS, suggesting a narrowing of some aspects of the digital divide.[39] While African countries

---

[35] Pamment, *New Public Diplomacy in the Twenty-first Century*, p. 3.

[36] Richard D. Waters, Emily Burnett, Ann Lamm and Jessica Lucas, 'Engaging Stakeholders through Social Networking: How Non-profit Organizations are Using Facebook', *Public Relations Review*, vol. 35 (2009), pp. 102–106.

[37] Cha, Yeo and Kim, 'Social Media's Dialogic Communication of Foreign Embassies in Korea and Public Diplomacy: Based on Dialogic Communication Theory', p. 177.

[38] McNutt, 'Public Engagement in the Web 2.0 Era', p. 64; Lee, and Kwak, 'An Open Government Maturity Model for Social Media-based Public Engagement', p. 499.

[39] Hilbert, 'The End Justifies the Definition', p. 2.

may lag behind Western countries in terms of internet penetration, computer infrastructure and internet accessibility, African governments seem to be equally active and as committed to engagement as their Western counterparts, if not more so.

In terms of the principle of generating return visits, this study's findings demonstrate that MFAs are significantly more active on Twitter than they are on Facebook. Moreover, the majority of Facebook posts seem to be accompanied by multimedia (that is, video and images), as opposed to only a small fraction of tweets. We postulate that these two findings are related. MFAs seem to use Twitter in order to broadcast 140 character-long spurs of diplomacy, through which they can quickly comment on world affairs. As Facebook posts are lengthier, and are often accompanied by multimedia, they are published at a later time. This time delay was most evident during the first time interval, when former South African President Nelson Mandela died. Shortly after the news of his death broke, the majority of MFAs in our sample tweeted a condolence message. Facebook posts were published several hours later and included images from Mandela's state visits.

The greater volume of MFA activity on Twitter that is observed in this study, however, does not offer insight with regard to the content shared by MFAs on this SNS. It may, however, be a significant finding given the differences between Twitter and Facebook. As Twitter may be viewed as a medium for information-sharing, and Facebook as a medium for social interaction, higher levels of Twitter activity could suggest that MFAs currently use SNS to publish continuously updated information rather than to interact with their online followers. Thus, the medium may be part of the message.

The congruence between the content published on Twitter and the content posted on Facebook was found to be extremely high among the majority of MFAs during both time intervals. The authors suggest that SNS users may wish to engage with MFAs, and to seek out information, on both Twitter and Facebook. As Pew's 2014 Social Media Update reveals, 52 per cent of American adults now use more than one SNS.[40] By publishing identical content on both Twitter and Facebook, MFAs may be reducing their ability to engage with visitors who are driven away by duplicate content.

The assessment of the principle of usefulness of information revealed that the vast majority of all SNS content was targeted at foreign populations. While MFAs publish a breadth of updated information, such information is not framed in a manner that is relevant to the domestic population. As such, MFAs may fail to communicate with their own citizenry, which may reduce citizens' confidence in the MFAs' ability to promote a nation's interests abroad. Moreover, lack of relevant information drives away the domestic population, preventing them from becoming advocates of a nation's foreign policy on their own SNS channels, an activity referred to as peer-to-peer diplomacy.[41]

This article proposes that the advent of digital diplomacy should not be viewed as a singular event but as part of the general migration of governments to the online world. Being part of the national government, MFAs' lack of interaction with followers may reduce citizens' trust in government as a whole.[42] The authors further propose that viewing digital diplomacy through the prism of E-government may aid MFAs in developing best practices for digital diplomacy, as they would benefit from the experience of other branches of government that have already transitioned to digital surroundings. National health organizations, for instance, have long since realized the web's potential to deliver health programmes that are tailored to the unique characteristics of individuals.[43] Tailoring digital diplomacy content to the unique characteristics of specific populations (such as language, culture and values) may

---

[40] Maeve Duggan *et al.*, 'Social Media Update 2014' (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, 9 January 2015), available online at http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014/.

[41] Shay Attias, 'Israel's New Peer-to-peer Diplomacy', *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 7, no. 4 (2012), pp. 473–482.

[42] Thomas A. Bryer, 'Designing Social Media Strategies for Effective Citizen Engagement: A Case Example and Model', *National Civic Review*, vol. 102, no. 1 (2012), pp. 43–50.

[43] For a review of the findings, see Mia L.A. Lustria, Juliann Cortese, Seth M. Noar and Robert L. Glueckauf, 'Computer-tailored Health Interventions Delivered over the Web: Review and Analysis of Key Components', *Patient Education and Counseling*, vol. 74, no. 2 (2009), pp. 156–173.

enable embassies to increase the usefulness of the information that they provide, thus facilitating the creation of relationships with online publics.

However, the issue of MFAs targeting online domestic audiences may require a more in-depth discussion regarding the ethics of such communication. Traditional public diplomacy had the goal of informing and *influencing* foreign populations.[44] The question that soon arises is whether MFAs are now using national resources in order to influence the national citizenry. From this perspective, US State Department tweets boasting of a new trade agreement may be an attempt to boost the popularity of a given administration.

During the second time interval, there was a significant difference between Twitter and Facebook in terms of the prevalence of topical categories. This may be attributed to the current affairs category, which included 13.3 per cent of all tweets published, as opposed to only 7.4 per cent of all Facebook posts (see Table 4 above). This increase could be a result of the Crimean crisis, as MFAs continuously commented on events taking place in eastern Ukraine. The study also found a statistical difference when comparing the prevalence of categories in Twitter between both time intervals. This could be a result of a decline in the prevalence of both the economic and hard power categories during the second time period. Finally, the study found a statistically significant difference when comparing the prevalence of categories in Facebook between the two time intervals. However, this was probably because of US State Department Q&A sessions that were held during the second time period, which temporarily increased the frequency of posts related to the category of engagement.

During both time intervals, the majority of MFA content dealt with bilateral issues, current affairs, multilateral issues and economic news. It is the high prevalence of the current affairs category during both time intervals that suggests that MFAs use SNS as a monologic medium for issuing ongoing press releases rather than as a tool for creating relationships, as proposed by Hayden.[45] However, our findings also indicate that MFAs publish information dealing with a wide variety of issues, ranging from economic agreements to nations' scientific achievements, and thereby catering to the needs of various audiences and meeting elements of the principle of usefulness of information.

As digital diplomacy uses web 2.0 applications, the authors also examined the adoption of a web 2.0 ethos by the MFAs in our sample. The results demonstrate that MFAs have yet to adopt such an ethos. As such, our results are similar to those found in studies focusing on public relations and E-government.[46] Like Macnamara, Sakinofsky and Beattie, this article postulates that a segment of SNS users visit MFA profiles because of a desire to learn more about the world in which they live and to take part in shaping it. By failing to meet followers' expectations of engagement co-production and collaboration, MFAs fail to mobilize such audiences.[47]

It is the lack of adoption of a web 2.0 ethos, coupled with the emphasis on information-sharing via Twitter rather than interaction through Facebook, that leads us to conclude that MFAs have so far failed to realize the dialogic potential of social media. The results of this study suggest that MFAs have essentially imported traditional working routines into a new online environment, employing web 1.0 practices in web 2.0 environments. Therefore, the road from digital diplomacy to diplomacy 2.0 remains one less travelled by MFAs.

The trends found in this study (that is, a higher volume of activity on Twitter, the use of multimedia on Facebook, and the lack of engagement) were observed across the majority of MFAs in our sample. There were, however, substantial differences in the manner in which each MFA practised this form of diplomacy. For example, the Polish MFA used its Facebook profile to promote the *Polska* brand; the UK Foreign Office operated a global blogosphere

[44] For a review of the evolution of public diplomacy definitions, see Bruce Gregory, 'American Public Diplomacy: Enduring Characteristics, Elusive Transformation', *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 6, no. 3 (2011), pp. 351–372.

[45] Hayden, 'Social Media at State', p. 3.

[46] For example, see Park and Reber, 'Relationship-building and the Use of Web Sites', pp. 410–411; and Dixon, 'Towards E-government 2.0', pp. 439–445.

[47] Macnamara, Sakinofsky and Beattie, 'E-electoral Engagement', pp. 625–627.

where diplomats could share work-related experiences with readers; and the United States used SNS to publicize its foreign aid projects around the world. It is this varied practice of digital diplomacy that suggests that MFAs may still be struggling to formulate best practices and working routines for this form of diplomacy. Future studies should examine whether diplomatic institutions have in fact formulated guidelines and best practices for digital diplomacy, and the extent to which these are now part of the training offered to diplomats.

Finally, it is important to note three of this study's limitations. First, the duration of study was limited to a six-week period. While this duration provided sufficient data for content analysis, a longer duration may be necessary to characterize fully the current practice of digital diplomacy and its trends. Second, our analysis of the adoption of a web 2.0 ethos by MFAs was limited to the second time interval. Thus, these findings offer a limited answer with regard to these particular aspects of digital diplomacy. Lastly, the sample was limited to nations that practise digital diplomacy in English. Future studies should be more inclusive and cover other nations that have embraced social media, such as Russia and Latin American countries. There is also a need for empirical work regarding the manner in which MFAs themselves define digital diplomacy and the term 'engagement', as well as an exploration of the incentives of MFA followers on SNS and their expectations from foreign ministries.

Ronit Kampf *is a lecturer in the Department of Communication and the research programme for Child and Youth Culture at Tel Aviv University in Israel. She conducted her post-doctoral studies at the Center for the Study of Language and Information at Stanford University in the United States. Her research interests focus on serious games and learning, particularly in the context of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. Her studies have been conducted in cross-cultural contexts, including Israel, Palestine, Turkey, Guatemala, Brazil and the United States.*

Ilan Manor *recently attained a Master's degree in Communication from Tel Aviv University, in Israel. His thesis explored the manner in which nations portray adversaries on official digital diplomacy channels during times of crisis. Manor's research on 'Selfie Diplomacy', or the manner in which nations use social media in nation-branding activities, was published in Corneliu Bjola and Marcus Holmes (eds),* Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice *(London: Routledge, 2015). His current research projects include a cross-national comparison of social media engagement among foreign ministries, a cross-national evaluation of digital diplomacy models adopted by European foreign ministries and an analysis of how digital diplomacy may be used as a tool for symbolic violence in diplomacy.*

Elad Segev *is a senior lecturer of Media and Communications at the Department of Communication, Tel Aviv University, Israel. He publishes studies on international news, the digital divide, information search, public understanding of science, and new applications and methodologies to utilize data-mining for social and communication research.*

< ADD APPENDIX 1 HERE >

< ADD APPENDIX 2 HERE >

< ADD APPENDIX 3 HERE >

< ADD APPENDIX 4 HERE >

Table 1: Average Daily Number of Tweets and Posts Published by MFAs*

MFA	First Time Interval		Second Time Interval	
	Average number of tweets	Average number of posts	Average number of tweets	Average number of posts
United Kingdom	12.6	2.5	17.2	2.2
Poland	7.5	1.1	13.4	0.6
Kenya	7.3	3.5	2.1	0.9
Somalia	6.9	1.5	0.9	0.6
Ethiopia	6.5	0.5	6.8	0.6
Israel	6.0	3.1	-	-
United States	5.3	3.2	13.4	3.4
India	4.6	1.9	5.9	9.3
Japan	3.1	3.1	2.2	2.4
South Korea	1.9	2.4	1.7	1.9
Rwanda	1.3	0.6	0.7	0.0

* First time interval n=492 Facebook posts and 1,330 tweets; second time interval n=462 Facebook posts and 1,359 tweets.

Table 2: Congruence Levels of Content Published on Facebook and Twitter by MFAs*

MFA	Congruence Rates	
	First Time Interval	**Second Time Interval**
Japan	100%	88.0%
United Kingdom	82.7%	80.9%
Ethiopia	81.8%	50.0%
Kenya	71.2%	78.9%
Somalia	64.5%	66.6%
South Korea	63.5%	87.5%
United States	55.2%	77.2%
Rwanda	41.7%	-**
Israel	37.9%	-
Poland	26.1%	41.7%
India	10.0%	17.3%

* First time interval n=492 Facebook posts and 1,330 tweets; second time interval n=462 Facebook posts and 1,359 tweets.

**Rwanda published no Facebook posts during the second time interval.

Table 3: Percentage of Facebook Posts and Tweets dealing with Foreign Issues by MFAs*

MFA	First Time Interval		Second Time Interval	
	Posts	**Tweets**	**Posts**	**Tweets**
India	97.5	94.8	82.1	98.4
South Korea	94.2	92.5	100	100
Israel	94.0	100	-	-
United States	88.1	86.0	95.8	89.4
Poland	87.0	84.8	100	98.9
Japan	86.2	89.4	98.0	95.7
Ethiopia	81.8	91.3	100	97.9
United Kingdom	75.0	83.0	95.7	95.0
Rwanda	66.7	77.8	-**	100
Kenya	65.8	60.4	94.7	68.9
Somalia	54.8	32.2	33.3	73.7

* First time interval n=492 Facebook posts and 1,330 tweets; second time interval n=462 Facebook posts and 1,359 tweets.

** Rwanda published no Facebook posts during the second time interval.

Table 4: Topical Category Prevalence by Medium and Time Interval*

	First Time Interval		Second Time Interval	
Category	**Twitter**	**Facebook**	**Twitter**	**Facebook**
Relations with Other Nations	30.9%	31.9%	35.7%	32.5%
Economic	15.1%	15.1%	9.5%	12.6%
Engagement with Followers	14.3%	9.6%	17.4%	19.8%
Diplomacy	11.5%	13.0%	10.0%	10.6%
Current Affairs	11.1%	13.9%	13.5%	7.4%
Hard Power	5.7%	3.6%	1.9%	3.9%
National Achievements	5.2%	6.1%	4.6%	5.4%
Soft Power	4.7%	5.3%	5.8%	6.3%

* First time interval n= 492 Facebook posts and 1,330 tweets; second time interval n=462 Facebook posts and 1,359 tweets.

Appendix 1: SNS Accounts by MFA

MFA	Facebook Profile	Twitter Channel
Ethiopia	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia https://www.facebook.com/MFAEthiopia	Ethiopian Diplomacy https://Twitter.com/mfaethiopia
India	Ministry of External Affairs, India https://www.facebook.com/MEAINDIA	Indian Diplomacy https://Twitter.com/IndianDiplomacy
Israel	Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs https://www.facebook.com/IsraelMFA	Israel Foreign Min. https://Twitter.com/IsraelMFA
Japan	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (English) https://www.facebook.com/Mofa.Japan.en	MOFA of Japan (English) https://Twitter.com/MofaJapan_en
Kenya	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade https://www.facebook.com/ForeignOfficeKE	ForeignAffairsKenya https://Twitter.com/ForeignOfficeKE
Poland	Polska.Pl https://www.facebook.com/polska	Poland MFA https://Twitter.com/PolandMFA
Rwanda	Rwanda Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation https://www.facebook.com/pages/Rwanda-Ministry-of-Foreign-Affairs-and-Cooperation/348608005219771	Rwanda MoFA https://Twitter.com/RwandaMFA
Somalia	Somali Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation https://www.facebook.com/SomaliMinisrtyofForeignAffairs*	Republic of Somalia https://Twitter.com/somaligov
South Korea	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea (English) https://www.facebook.com/mofakr.eng	MOFA (English) https://Twitter.com/MOFAkr_eng
United Kingdom	Foreign Office https://www.facebook.com/foreignoffice?	Foreign Office (FCO) https://Twitter.com/foreignoffice
United States	US Department of State https://www.facebook.com/usdos	Department of State https://Twitter.com/StateDept

*Page no longer available on Facebook

Appendix 2: Sample of Countries Included in the Feasibility Study

Region	Countries
Europe	Albania, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, EU, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom
Middle East	Bahrain, Dubai, Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, United Arab Emirates
Asia	Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Singapore, South Korea, Thailand
North America	Canada, Mexico, United States
South America	Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru
Africa	Botswana, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, Somalia, South Africa
Pacific/Caribbean	Australia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago

Appendix 3: Glossary of Categories

Subject Matter	Name of Category	Explanation	Example
Relations with Other Nations	Bilateral	Issues dealing with Bilateral relations between two countries	Israel–Russia mixed economic committee to convene in Moscow
	Multilateral	A country's relationship with several other countries or international organizations	Israel, Jordan and the Palestinian Authority sign Red Sea–Dead Sea canal deal, securing 100 million metric cubes of water for residents of the region
	Tweet directed at other world leader	Instances in which one leader communicates directly via social network with another world leader	UK Foreign Minister sends congratulations to new German Foreign Minister
	Diaspora	Issues relating to a country's diaspora abroad	Somali American diaspora celebrates 50 years of achievement of the first Somali professor at an American university
Soft Power	Strategic partnerships	International partnerships where military force and defence strategy is shared by several countries	UK Foreign Minister in Brussels for NATO summit
	Global initiatives	A country's global initiative	South Korea's Global Green Growth Institute gains observer status at the UN General Assembly
	Country in global initiatives	When countries participate in global initiatives	US theme for UN AIDS World Day
Hard Power	Military	Issues dealing with the use of military force; news regarding military personnel	In Iraq, dogs assist the military in finding landmines
	National security	Issued dealing directly with a country's national security or instances in which the term national security is used	US Secretary of State John Kerry testifies before Congress, saying that US national security is stronger after an Iran deal
	Safety of citizens abroad	Ensuring safety of citizens abroad; instances when citizens were harmed abroad	UK releases details of special flights leaving Juba, South Sudan, and the evacuation of British nationals
Economic	Economy	Issues relating to global and local economies	OECD secretary-general presents finding of the 2013 Israel survey
	Economy–tourism	Issues relating specifically to tourism and its impact on the economy	UK official meets with Egyptian diplomat to explore ways of increasing UK tourism to Egypt

	Economy–trade	Trade agreements between countries	Technological cooperation agreement signed between Rwanda and Congo
	Foreign Aid	Foreign aid provided by one nation to another	Poland awards grants for projects in East Timor
	Foreign Aid — receiving	Foreign aid received by a country	Kenya gets funding from African and Norwegian funds for the largest wind farm in East Africa
Engagement with Followers	Engagement	Instances in which MFAs directly engage with followers	Kenya provides information in answer to question by Twitter follower attempting to leave Juba, South Sudan, as internal fighting breaks out
	Invitation to engage	Instances in which followers were invited to engage with MFAs	Invitation to Google hangout dealing with US participation in the International Disability Treaty
	Invitation to read/watch	Instances in which followers were invited to read/watch material published by an MFA	UK invites followers to read a blog by a UK official who rescued British citizens after typhoon
National Achievements	Congratulations	One nation congratulating another on achievement	UK prime minister offers congratulations to Kenya on its golden jubilee
	Cultural	Issues relating to a country's cultural heritage or cultural exchanges between countries	Japanese food tradition recognized as important to human heritage by UNESCO
	Scientific	A country's scientific accomplishments	Israel becomes a full member in the CERN project
	History	Issues dealing with a country's shared history	UK prime minister visits graves of Commonwealth soldiers who died during the First World War
Diplomacy	MFA-related news	Issues concerning a country's MFA	Special thanks to Somali cyber teams and their cyber commander for news as it happens locally and globally
	Appointments	Appointments of diplomats to various posts	Republic of Korea's ambassador to the OECD elected as chairman of the OECD Audit Committee
	State visits	Visit by heads of state to a foreign country	US Vice-President Joe Biden visits Japan
Current Affairs		Immediate comments on events taking place around the world	US says Ukraine's response to protest does not befit a democracy

Appendix 4: The Prevalence of 26 Topical Categories by Medium and Time Interval*

	First Time Interval		Second Time Interval	
	Twitter	Facebook	Twitter	Facebook
Bilateral	20.7%	23.8%	24.9%	22.5%
Current affairs	11.1%	13.9%	13.1%	7.4%
Invitation to read/watch	7.3%	7.2%	16.5%	12.8%
Multilateral	8.7%	7.2%	10.6%	9.8%
State visit	9.5%	11.9%	9.4%	8.6%
Economy	2.4%	2.4%	7.0%	8.3%
Economy–trade	7.5%	5.7%	1.1%	0.3%
Foreign aid	3.4%	3.1%	1.1%	3.9%
Engagement	4.8%	0.3%	0.9%	5.5%
Cultural	2.9%	3.6%	1.2%	3.3%
Global initiatives	1.1%	2.1%	1.4%	2.6%
Safety of citizens abroad	3.1%	1.8%	0.4%	1.5%
Invitation to engage	2.2%	2.1%	0.0%	1.6%
Economy–tourism	1.7%	3.5%	0.3%	0.0%
National achievements	2.1%	1.7%	0.6%	0.9%
History	1.5%	0.9%	2%	0.7%
National security	2.2%	0.9%	0.7%	1.3%
Global initiatives	2.6%	2.5%	1.7%	2.9%
Strategic partnership	0.9%	0.7%	2.5%	0.9%
MFA-related news	1.4%	0.7%	0.3%	1.7%
Scientific	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%

Military	0.5%	0.8%	0.8%	1.1%
Diaspora	1.3%	0.9%	0.2%	0.2%
Congratulations	0.1%	0.7%	0.5%	0.0%
Appointments	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%
Foreign aid — receiving	0.2%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%

* First time interval n=492 Facebook posts and 1,330 tweets; second time interval n=462 Facebook posts and 1,359 tweets.