

This is an Author Accepted Manuscript version of the following chapter: Rikkonen, L., Helsinki-Based Embassies and Ambassadors on Twitter – An Analysis of Communication Goals and Rhetorical Ethos in Diplomatic Twitter Practice, published in *Artificial Intelligence and Digital Diplomacy: Challenges and Opportunities*, edited by F. Roumate, 2021, Springer, reproduced with permission of Springer Nature Switzerland AG. The final authenticated version is available online at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68647-5_11.

Users may only view, print, copy, download and text- and data-mine the content, for the purposes of academic research. The content may not be (re-)published verbatim in whole or in part or used for commercial purposes. Users must ensure that the author's moral rights as well as any third parties' rights to the content or parts of the content are not compromised.

HELSINKI-BASED EMBASSIES AND AMBASSADORS ON TWITTER – AN ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATION GOALS AND RHETORICAL ETHOS IN DIPLOMATIC TWITTER PRACTICE

*Lassi Rikkonen**

Faculty of Information Technology and Communication Sciences, Tampere University

ABSTRACT

This study examines what types of communication goals are pursued in embassies' and ambassadors' tweets, and how rhetorical ethos is constructed in ambassadors' Twitter use. Theoretical framework is inspired by an interdisciplinary focus stemming from both public diplomacy theory and the rhetorical tradition of communication research. Analyzed data consists of 8,033 tweets sent by 27 embassies and 13 ambassadors based in Helsinki, Finland, during 2018. The findings suggest that embassies send more self-presentational tweets compared to ambassadors. Self-presentational tweets relate mainly to country promotion. Correspondingly, ambassadors send more tweets with relational goals. Relational tweets concern building and maintaining relations between the diplomats and their foreign publics, but they can also include representations of relations between states. Roughly 15 % of the tweets were considered as instrumental (e.g., political statements). To summarize the aspects related to rhetorical ethos, ambassadors seem to have a tendency to act as agents of goodwill on Twitter. Although some disagreements are manifested, they do not seem to pursue strong divisions. Regarding negative issues between states, ambassadors seem to act as advocates for their own countries only.

Keywords: Twitter, social media, public diplomacy, communication goals, rhetorical ethos

* Corresponding Author address
Email: lassi.rikkonen@tuni.fi

INTRODUCTION

In the broad sense, “public diplomacy refers to communication that governments and other diplomatic actors make to the general public” (Pigman 2010, p. 121). With more than 321 million monthly active users worldwide (Twitter Inc., 2019), Twitter provides a convenient platform for the practitioners of public diplomacy to engage the global publics. Since on Twitter one can reach a very large audience without having a direct connection – being “friends” or belonging to the same group, for instance – it is perhaps no surprise that Twitter is the social media channel of choice for the political leaders and governments worldwide (Twiplomacy, 2018). Twitter also offers the public figures a chance to bypass the mainstream media and therefore allows them to decide what to publish and when. In fact, the use of Twitter has not rendered the traditional media meaningless. On the contrary, Twitter is frequently used by the journalists as a source for political news (Moon & Hadley, 2014; Broersma & Graham, 2013). Thus, the impact of tweets reaches well beyond Twitter and its users.

This study focuses on Twitter communication of foreign embassies and ambassadors in Helsinki, Finland. Embassies (or permanent diplomatic missions) could be labeled as some sort of engine rooms of diplomatic practice. Their significance in communication between states continues to this day, regardless of the fact that their history traces back over a half millennium (Black 2010, p. 53). For instance, Finland, a country of 5.5 million people, had a network of 73 embassies in 2017 (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, 2018). The United States has the largest number of embassies: the U.S. had 167 embassies around the world in 2017 (Lowy Institute, 2018). However, despite their continuing presence in international relations, the duties of embassies have faced some alterations. Performing public relations practices and promoting democratic values along with human rights are now accompanying the more traditional representation, negotiation, observation, economic, cultural and military duties (Kleiner, 2010).

Indeed, a recent study showed that diplomatic approaches blend into public relations strategies in embassies’ Twitter use (Dodd & Collins, 2017). In addition to public relations, researchers have related public diplomacy to many different concepts, such as propaganda, marketing, nation branding, lobbying, strategic communication, and partnership building (Löffelholz, Auer and Srugies, 2015; Copeland, 2009). However, this new form of digital diplomacy cannot be simply accounted as a new way of conducting the traditional one-way public diplomacy. For instance, Duncombe (2017) suggests that Twitter should be seen as a potential platform for dialogue between states in cases where face-to-face diplomatic interactions are limited. She adds that Twitter can shape the struggle for recognition, and thereby legitimize political possibilities for change. Hence, Twitter is not just another channel for public diplomacy, but it may enhance the dynamics of international relations. Embassies and ambassadors seem to play a part in this, and this study aims at better understanding of their actions on Twitter and their place in the public diplomacy realm.

As embassies communicate on Twitter, they face a kind of an inherent contradiction. Melgin and Nieminen (2018) point out that diplomacy is both a process of international relations and a skill of getting along with people proficiently and without causing threats. Twitter, however, as a communication channel, seems to require simplification, promote impulsive behavior and generate impoliteness (Ott, 2017). Diplomacy scholar-practitioner Shaun Riordan (2017) has also referred

to this over-simplifying quality of social media – and the new quasi-diplomatic actors, such as NGOs and global companies – stating that actors other than professional diplomats often see the world in black and white and demand for optimal outcomes rather than pursue acceptable outcomes as the diplomats do. Thus, to be successful in their public diplomacy efforts, embassies and ambassadors need to adapt to an environment that they might consider unnatural. Compared to some other Twitter users, diplomats may be more inclined to a well-mannered and polite communication style, but this may also cause trouble. For instance, Mustajoki (2018, p. 53) refers to “everyday diplomacy” as a mean to influence others’ behavior and opinions without causing conflicts, but also reminds that there is always a possibility for misunderstandings if we rely too much on politeness and excessively soften our communication. Hence, many challenges accompany the opportunities that Twitter offers.

The aim of this chapter is to provide a versatile summary of a rapidly emerging way to conduct public digital diplomacy. It is inspired by an interdisciplinary focus stemming from both public diplomacy theory and the rhetorical tradition of communication research. The focus of this study is to seek answers to the questions, what types of communication goals are employed in embassies’ and ambassadors’ tweets, and do embassy and ambassador accounts differ from each other in terms of the goals. In addition, rhetorical ethos constructed in ambassadors’ tweets is also analyzed. In the next section, I will provide a brief overview of theoretical aspects regarding public diplomacy functions, communication goals, and rhetorical ethos. Then, I will describe the context and methodology of the study before proceeding to the analysis. Finally, I will discuss the practical and theoretical implications of the results.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Public diplomacy functions

Theoretical framework for this study is inspired by an interdisciplinary focus stemming from both public diplomacy theory and the rhetorical tradition of communication research. A basic assumption is that human individuals communicate in order to achieve their personal goals (Clark & Delia, 1979; Canary & Cody, 1994). Similarly, diplomatic communication is based on the idea that the sovereign countries can achieve their goals by communicating with each other (Watson, 1982; Berridge, 2002). By no means is this type of an analogy a way of saying that sovereign states should be assimilated with human individuals. Nevertheless, it offers a fresh perspective to the study of public diplomacy, which is regarded as an integral part of contemporary diplomacy by many scholars (e.g., Pigman, 2010; Melissen 2005; Sharp, 2009; Riordan, 2003).

Even though measuring the effectiveness of public diplomacy is difficult, Pigman (2010, pp. 136–137) claims that successful public diplomacy is likely to have a major impact in the governments’ and other diplomatic actors’ efforts in gaining the public support for policy initiatives. As technological development has made it possible to directly engage with the public, professional diplomats are now facing a new challenge with public diplomacy (Kleiner, 2010, pp. 7–8). Löffelholz et al. (2015) have remarked, that the majority of public diplomacy actors tend to

be neglectful towards evaluating entire public diplomacy strategies and their impact, as they often only evaluate single public diplomacy activities. Therefore, operating an embassy Twitter account might be a separate function from other public diplomacy activities, and it is unclear how strategic these actions actually are. This duty might also be assigned to just a handful of people who operate on different levels of resources available.

Analysis of networks has been a relatively popular approach for the study of public diplomacy in social media. For instance, Seib (2012) and Papacharissi (2015) emphasize the importance of operationalized networks during the Arab Spring in 2011. During such events that have major consequences for the international community, diplomats might become overwhelmed by the participatory intensity they can generate (Seib, 2012, p. 141). Zappavigna (2012, p. 96) provides a good insight for a better understanding of the networks in Twitter, calling the connections between people as ambient affiliation. They are ambient in the sense that Twitter users who form a network may not necessarily ever interact directly and likely do not know each other. Therefore, professional diplomats who communicate on Twitter might often face situations in which the networks are somewhat obscure.

While approaching the public diplomacy issues through the logic of networks might seem like a fruitful idea, it has some downsides. Network analysis might tell us much about groups, relationships and networked gatekeeping – the structures that are constantly shaping the international reality (Manor, 2018) – but it tells very little about the actual qualities of Twitter interaction. In their analysis of embassy Twitter accounts Dodd and Collins (2017) adapted Cull's (2008) taxonomy of public diplomacy. Cull divides public diplomacy into five key elements that are (1) listening, (2) advocacy, (3) cultural diplomacy, (4) exchange diplomacy, and (5) international news broadcasting. Dodd and Collins's (2017) study suggests that Western embassies engage primarily in advocacy and Central Eastern European embassies engage primarily in cultural diplomacy approaches in their Twitter use.

Hallahan (2015, p. 247) emphasizes the importance of separating organizational goals from communication objectives. While organizational goals refer to the desirable end results pursued by an organization, communication objectives concern changing people's behavior. Accomplishing these objectives is necessary to achieve organizational goals. Whereas Cull's (2008) taxonomy refers to the broader objectives of public diplomacy, it may not necessarily be applicable when analyzing single tweets. This problem is particularly present with the first element, 'listening'. Dodd and Collins (2017) identified listening as the least frequent, if not completely neglected, approach. A valid question is, if listening is viewed as something that becomes visible in the content of the messages, or if it is something that only becomes visible in receiver's behavior, as either communication acts or concrete actions.

Along with Dodd & Collins (2017), Twitter communication by embassies has also been studied by others. Yet, the overall amplitude of the research on this topic remains relatively limited. For example, Sotkasiira & Riiheläinen (2018) have studied the Twitter feed of the Russian embassy in London in Spring 2017, concluding that the embassy Twitter account had been associated with the Russian information warfare activities. Their analysis of the tweets sent by the embassy was based on classifying the tweets as either positive or negative.

Starting from the fact that the scholars and practitioners of public diplomacy hold various perspectives on the primary functions of public diplomacy, Fitzpatrick (2010, p. 89) has reviewed more than 150 definitions of public diplomacy. She identified six functional categories on public diplomacy: (1) advocacy/influence, (2) communication/informational, (3) relational, (4) promotional, (5) warfare/propaganda, and (6) political (Fitzpatrick, 2010). Compared to Cull's (2008) taxonomy, this functional approach to public diplomacy proposed by Fitzpatrick (2010) may be more suitable for investigating embassies' and ambassadors' Twitter use, because the categories are more concise in terms of what types of messages they may refer to.

While public diplomacy has been a well-established topic of research, and public diplomacy on Twitter has also received some attention, a functional approach to public diplomacy on Twitter has received less attention. In this study, the focus is on the question: What do the embassies and the ambassadors use Twitter for? Instead of analyzing the actual public diplomacy functions of tweeting, the emphasis is on the communication goals and rhetorical ethos.

Communication goals and rhetorical ethos

The purpose of this study is to examine what types of communication goals are employed in embassies' and ambassadors' tweets, and how rhetorical ethos is constructed in ambassadors' tweets. Communication goals theory provides a good basis for the analysis of public diplomacy because of its overlapping qualities with the six functional categories of public diplomacy suggested by Fitzpatrick (2010, p. 89). Additionally, scrutinizing rhetorical ethos permits a more complete analysis of the data as ethos relates to public communicators' character, credibility, and persuasiveness.

As Canary and Cody (1994) suggest, communication is the primary tool people use to achieve their goals with others. They have proposed that there are three general types of goals that people seek through communication: self-presentational goals, relational goals, and instrumental goals. Self-presentational goals refer to communicating an image of who we are and how we want to be perceived. Relational goals deal with developing, maintaining and neglecting relationships. Instrumental goals, such as changing opinions, adjusting habits, or seeking assistance, involve communication that is focused on obtaining personal favors or resources.

It is important to note, that goals are not exclusive, and people may try to advance multiple goals simultaneously (Canary & Cody, 1994, pp. 10–14). Therefore, a message that carries relational aspirations could also include self-presentational and instrumental goals. Dillard (2004, pp. 187–189) separates communication goals into primary and secondary ones. He suggests, that primary goals are usually instrumental by their nature and they might relate to several types of influence goals, including gaining assistance, giving advice, sharing activity, changing orientation, changing relationship, obtaining permission and enforcing rights and obligations. Secondary goals arise from the adoption of a primary goal and are usually related to identity goals or relational goals (Dillard, 2004, p. 189).

To further these communication goals, communicators usually draw from the three rhetorical appeals: ethos, pathos, and logos (Aristotle, n.d.). Thus, along with pathos and logos, which refer to emotional and logical aspects of public speaking, ethos is one of the key factors of

persuasiveness. It relates to the credibility and the character of a public communicator. According to Crick (2017, p. 164), ethos has become a powerful persuasive tool of the digital age because it focuses audience's attention on those messages that come from respected individuals. Gurak (2018, p. 125) suggests that the significance of ethos is intensified because of the immense speed at which the new communication technologies such as Twitter lead people to read and process complex information. Therefore, implementing an ethos that is appealing to the public may increase ambassadors' chances to conduct successful digital diplomacy.

Rhetorical ethos is generally seen as a composition of goodwill, practical wisdom and virtue (Aristotle, n.d.). Crick (2017) summarizes these categories as follows:

Goodwill represents an emotional attitude of the speaker toward the audience such that he or she appears to wish the very best for the person or people to whom the rhetor is speaking....Practical wisdom represents an intellectual capacity to make decisions in complicated situations....Virtue represents a condition of character that embodies multiple values, such as courage, temperance, generosity, humility, and the like. (p. 177)

Crick (2017) further remarks that establishing ethos is a complex process and that ethos should not be confused with personal concepts such as affection, trust, or reputation. He suggests that we should pay attention to how public communicators strive to establish their own ethos through constructing a persona, evoking an audience, identification, distinction, and polarization. Additionally, ethos goes hand in hand with role management. According to Hart, Daughton & LaVally (2018, pp. 231–232) the common rhetorical characters are the apologist (who focuses on rebuffing attacks), the agent (who speaks on behalf of institutions), the partisan (who resembles the agent, but mostly speaks mostly his or her own truths), and the hero (who devotes him- or herself to a good cause). These roles do not exclude each other and there usually is at least some role flexibility, but rhetors should still try to choose their roles with keeping emotional integrity and dramatic consistency in mind (Hart et al., 2018, pp. 231–232).

It is important to separate persona from inherited ethos; whereas inherited ethos is formed cumulatively through history, persona is a rhetorical creation constructed in language (Crick 2017, p. 164). It is apparent that diplomats inherit some ethos from their predecessors and the countries that they represent – probably in both good and bad – but they also have a possibility to create their own persona in rhetorical situations. While there may be a general presumption about how diplomats communicate and present themselves, there are no limits to what types of personae diplomats may attempt to create. A more accurate description of how communication goals and rhetorical ethos were examined in this study is provided in the following section.

METHOD

Context and preconditions

Finland is a country of 5.5 million people. As a member of the European Union and many international organizations, Finland has proven to be an active participant in the international community. Its role has been prominent in arctic and development cooperation, peacekeeping, and human rights advocacy. Finland has also been a forerunner in technological development, for instance in building high-speed information networks. Throughout its independence the Finnish foreign policy has been determined to some extent by the proximity of Russia. Although Finland officially remains militarily unallied, the last few years have been characterized by increasing defence cooperation with other Western countries.

The emphasis of this study is on how the foreign embassies and ambassadors use Twitter as a channel when they engage the Finnish public. Thus, the analysis is focused on those tweets that are written in one of Finland's official languages (Finnish and Swedish) or in English, which is the most widely spoken foreign language in Finland (European Commission, 2012, p. 21). It is yet necessary to notice that there are various groups of foreign language speakers in Finland that can be considered significant. Apart from the general public, the embassies can also target their messages at those groups of people who speak some other language as their first language. While the foreign language speakers form just 6 % of the Finnish population and even the largest foreign language groups (Russian – 77,177 speakers, Estonian – 49,590, Arabic – 26,467) are relatively small when compared to the whole population (Official Statistics of Finland, 2017), they might still form significant proportions of the embassies' and ambassadors' Twitter followers.

Data collection

In 2018, 64 foreign embassies operated in Helsinki. Roughly half of them were active on Twitter – managing an embassy account or an ambassador's account, or both. For this study, 40 active embassy/ambassador accounts were identified. Data was collected in two phases. Partial data was collected in early November 2018 and the analysis method was tested on collected material. The actual data (including the number of followers and the number of followed accounts of each 40 accounts) was collected on February 9, 2019. Data collection was performed by using GetOldTweets3 Python 3 library and a corresponding command line utility (Mottl, 2018). This Python library is based on the original GetOldTweets-python by Jefferson Henrique (2016). GetOldTweets3 was modified for this study to include the reply count and language data of a tweet.

Using a modified code, all tweets sent to and from 40 embassy/ambassador accounts (27 official embassy accounts and 13 ambassador's personal accounts) during 2018 were collected from Twitter. Thus, the raw data, 17,855 tweets in all, includes the tweets that are sent by or directed to these accounts or in which they are mentioned. Roughly half of these tweets, 8,033 in total, were sent by the 40 embassy/ambassador's accounts. Quotes are included in this data, but retweets are not. The retweets sent by embassies and ambassadors were collected separately from

Twitter UI with certain limitations (see Appendix 1). The analysis in this study is based on these 8,033 tweets.

Data classification and analysis

The methods used in this study are theory-based content analysis and rhetorical analysis. Tweets by embassies and ambassadors were classified in categories based on the three communication goals (Canary & Cody, 1994; Dillard, 2004). Two additional categories ('other' and 'foreign language') were added to involve the tweets that could not be classified under any of the communication goals categories or were written in languages other than Finnish, Swedish and English. Hence, the tweets have been classified in five categories which are (1) self-presentational, (2) relational, (3) instrumental, (4) other, and (5) foreign language. Data classification is primarily based on tweets' textual data. Each of the 8,033 tweets was assigned into a category that was observed to be the most appropriate regarding the tweets content. Pictures and videos included in the tweets were considered in those cases in which classification was not possible relying solely on textual examination.

IBM SPSS Statistics 25 is used for quantitative data analysis. In addition to presenting descriptive statistics on data, independent samples t-test is used to determine the differences between embassies' and ambassadors' Twitter use. Pearson's correlation coefficient is used as the measure of association between variables. As for qualitative analysis, in addition to the analysis of rhetorical ethos in ambassadors' tweeting, the compositions of three communication goal categories were also analyzed. Rhetorical ethos is analyzed through close reading of the ambassadors' tweets. The analysis of ethos is based on the Aristotelian categories of ethos – practical wisdom, virtue, and goodwill – but other aspects such as identification, polarization, common characters, and evoking an audience (see Crick, 2017; Hart et al., 2018) were considered as well. In tweet citations the text content is presented exactly in the same way as it was originally tweeted, but links, pictures, quotes or videos are not presented.

GOALS IN EMBASSIES' AND AMBASSADORS' TWEETS

Approximately two thirds of the tweets (N=8,033) sent by the forty embassy/ambassador accounts consist of messages targeted at publics in Finland and at the diplomatic community. The foreign language tweets are considered to be targeted at the citizens of the country in questions. In terms of primary communication goals, 32.1 % of the tweets were relational, 19.8 % were self-presentational, and 14.6 % were instrumental. 29.5 % of the tweets sent by embassies and ambassadors were written entirely in languages other than Finnish, Swedish and English. 4 % of the tweets were categorized as 'other', since they did not indicate a certain communication goal. Figures on each Twitter account are presented in Appendix 1.

By average, each tweet contained 1.54 hashtags (#) and mentioned 0.81 other Twitter accounts (@). However, there were 3,698 tweets with no hashtag included and 4,778 tweets in which no other Twitter account was mentioned. 9.0 % of the tweets were replies to other Twitter users. Each

tweet generated approximately 0.31 replies, 4.23 retweets and 8.75 likes (favorite). The Embassy of Poland (@PLinFinland) accounts for the largest retweet count (450) and the favorite count (1,423) with its tweet about the Finnish MFA's celebrations of Poland's 100 years anniversary of regaining independence (PLinFinland, 2018). The largest reply count (79) was evoked by Ukraine's Ambassador Andrii Olefirov's (@AndriiOlefirov) tweet written in Ukrainian (Olefirov, 2018c).

To examine closer the differences in the proportions of different communication goals employed by embassies and ambassadors, an independent samples t-test was conducted on the data with a 95% confidence interval for the mean difference. There was a significant difference in the average proportion of self-presentational tweets sent by embassies ($M=23.05\%$, $SD=15.69\%$) and by ambassadors ($M=7.37\%$, $SD=4.19\%$); $t(32.71)=4.85$, $p < .001$. There was also a significant difference in the average proportion of relational tweets sent by ambassadors ($M=58.81\%$, $SD=23.49\%$) and by embassies ($M=31.50\%$, $SD=24.55\%$); $t(38)=3.39$, $p < .01$. These results suggest that embassies send more tweets with self-presentational goals compared to ambassadors. Correspondingly, ambassadors send relatively more tweets with relational goals compared to embassies. These results are further supported by observations on those countries that have both embassy and ambassador Twitter accounts ($n=9$). As for the proportions of different communication goals employed by embassies and ambassadors, for all but two of those countries the embassies sent more self-presentational tweets and the ambassadors sent more relational tweets.

Another significant difference was noticed in the average proportion of tweets categorized as 'other' sent by ambassadors ($M=7.35\%$, $SD=6.43\%$) and by embassies ($M=1.43\%$, $SD=1.87\%$); $t(38)=4.46$, $p < .001$. This result suggests that embassies follow their Twitter strategies more carefully than ambassadors. As ambassadors represent their countries in Twitter, they also represent themselves as persons, which might result in larger number of personal messages (e.g., pictures without a description) that could not be categorized in this study. Other significant differences between embassies' and ambassadors' communication goals were not observed.

Whereas the use of hashtags may be a potential way to increase the reach of tweets, it seems that in public diplomacy Twitter sphere the use of hashtags does not necessarily lead to more extensive interactivity – if interactivity is defined in terms of how many times a tweet is replied to, retweeted, or favored. Embassy accounts employed more hashtags ($M=2.01$, $SD=2.33$) in their tweets ($n=4705$) when compared with the tweets from ambassador accounts ($n=3328$) ($M=.88$, $SD=1.46$); $t(7922.86)=26.48$, $p < .001$. However, tweets from ambassador accounts received more replies ($M=.47$, $SD=1.84$) than tweets from embassy accounts ($M=.20$, $SD=.73$); $t(4074.90)=-8.12$, $p < .001$. Additionally, tweets from ambassador accounts were retweeted more often ($M=7.34$, $SD=20.60$) than tweets from embassy accounts ($M=2.03$, $SD=9.26$); $t(4284.76)=-13.90$, $p < .001$. Tweets from ambassador accounts were also favored more often ($M=12.66$, $SD=29.10$) than tweets from embassy accounts ($M=5.98$, $SD=$); $t(6782.36)=-10.48$, $p < .001$. However, effect size (Hedges' g) for each category was small; for replies (.21), retweets (.35), and favorites (.24).

These findings may be connected to the differences in the proportions of each communication goal in tweeting. While self-presentational, relational, and instrumental tweets all represent different communicative functions, they also seem to differ from each other in terms of how they are generally responded to. Key figures for each type of tweet are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Key figures of each type of tweet regarding replies, retweets, likes (favored), mentions (other accounts that are mentioned), and hashtags

	Self-Presentational (n=1588)		Relational (n=2581)		Instrumental (n=1176)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Replies	.17	.63	.25	.84	.27	.82
Retweets	1.78	4.44	2.76	12.29	5.07	16.71
Favored	5.27	13.02	9.62	34.65	5.31	16.52
Mentions	.58	.95	1.50	1.65	.45	1.01
Hashtags	2.89	2.91	1.42	1.65	1.35	1.64

There was no statistically significant difference in the average number of followers between embassy accounts ($M=1836.56$, $SD=2090.73$) and ambassador accounts ($M=1558.77$, $SD=2740.06$). Regarding the number of followers, the only significant correlation was observed with the number of tweets sent in 2018, $r(38)=.61$, $p < .001$. The choice of communication goals does not seem to have an impact on the number of followers. The composition of the three communication goals in embassies' and ambassadors' tweets is analyzed more closely in the next three sections.

Self-presentational tweets: Country promotion and “did you know” bulletins

Of all three communication goals in embassies' and ambassadors' tweets, self-presentational tweets seem to be the most straightforward regarding country promotion and marketing. The vast majority of these tweets tend to focus on spreading out positive images of the country in question. By different “did you know” bulletins, the countries try to tell the public about themselves and make themselves seem interesting. Praising the successes of compatriots and promoting events held in homeland is common.

The tweets with self-presentational goals are clearly addressed to the general public in Finland. Most of the tweets that relate to culture and travel fall into this category. For some of the embassies, especially for Italy (@ItalyinFIN) and Mexico (@EmbaMexFin), Twitter seems to be harnessed into the purpose of promoting traveling possibilities. This is an example of public diplomacy functions blending into marketing activities. Other countries, such as Poland, seem to focus on presenting information about history, inventions and art. Many of the self-presentational tweets could also be classified as instrumental tweets because of their informational aspirations. However, they seem to lack statements on diplomacy or politics in general, and they tend to focus only on the positive aspects of the countries in question. With these tweets countries may try to escape the potential confrontations with the Twitter community. Consequently, self-presentational tweets lack both the high intimacy level of relational tweets and the frankness of instrumental tweets. While constantly telling something about themselves and their countries – probably as instructed by MFAs – embassies and ambassadors might actually reveal very little.

Relational tweets: Congratulations and diplomatic friend pictures

Relational tweets sent by embassies and ambassadors concern building and maintaining relations between the diplomats and their foreign colleagues and publics, but they can also include representations of relations between states. Tweets that would neglect or dissolve relations were not detected in the data. As noted above, relational tweets seem to form the core of ambassadors' Twitter use. Most of all, this category is formed by customary congratulations messages, condolences and expressions of gratefulness. Thanking colleagues seems to be very common. The other main constituent of this category is something that could be called as 'diplomatic friend pictures'. It seems to be very common among the diplomats to post pictures with colleagues with a short commentary about the occasion. Usually these messages seem to include a hint about what is on the agenda, but no further information about political stances or negotiation outcomes. In general, relational tweets include considerable amount of name-dropping, which can also be regarded as an indirect strategy of self-presentation.

Relational tweets seem to be kind of multipurpose messages, or at least they could serve many different audiences. While they seem to be targeted at the diplomatic community itself, they also express the state of international relations to the general public. These tweets tend to highlight the good relations between Finland and the country in question. They also create an image of what modern diplomatic life is, and reveal it to the public. Furthermore, relational tweets could act as some sort of a logbook, which could be monitored by interested followers at home. Taken together, these findings suggest that the tweets that are primarily relational in their nature are probably more versatile and multi-functional compared to self-presentational and instrumental tweets. They seem to address many different audiences and simultaneously carry information that is related to the other two goal categories.

Instrumental tweets: Straightforward statements and casual job advertisements

Whereas relational tweets might carry hints about what already is on the agenda, instrumental tweets tend to concern issues that countries want to add to the agenda. A large part of the instrumental tweet corpus is formed by straightforward political statements that declare countries' stances on different issues. However, there is a great variation in the composition of instrumental tweets, and they do not necessarily concern political statements. For some embassies, Twitter seems to be an important channel for conducting daily operations. For instance, the Embassy of Ireland (@IrishEmbFinland) and the Embassy of United Kingdom (@ukinfinland) tweet constantly about Brexit (a process that is still in the making at the moment of writing this chapter) and thereby inform their own citizens of its' possible impact on them. The latter also tweets constantly about open vacancies at the embassy. The most of the instrumental tweets sent by the Embassy of India (@IndEmbFinEst) concern visa-related instructions.

The overall impression arising from the data refers to the general absence of diplomatic protest. In fact, negative issues related to other states are addressed only by Ukraine (@UA_Emb_FI), Georgia (@geo_embassy), United Kingdom, Israel (@IsraelinFinland) and Mexico. With the first

three the criticism is targeted at Russia, while Israel criticizes Palestine and Mexico has a dispute with the United States. Some of these aspects of tweeting that concern negative issues with other are discussed more closely in next section.

REMARKS ON AMBASSADORS' RHETORICAL ETHOS

It is probably justifiable to begin with the Ukrainian Ambassador Andrii Olefirov. As for the number of tweets sent during the year 2018, Olefirov was the most active of the thirteen ambassadors who were observed, sending 1,663 tweets. He was also the most followed ambassador, and the only one with over ten thousand followers. It is worth to notice that Olefirov's busy Twitter account has remained completely silent since September 18, 2018. The explanation for this was made public later as it was reported that Olefirov had suffered a serious injury in an accident at the Embassy of Ukraine, and that it was impossible for him to continue his work in Finland (Hakala, 2019).

The nature of Olefirov's Twitter feed is perhaps summarized the best by himself in a tweet on March 12, 2018: "*I don't know how many tweets are enough to stop Russian's bloodshed in Ukraine, I'm crying out to stop that. #StopRussianAggression*" (Olefirov, 2018b). Olefirov's tweeting seems to happen in thematic bursts. Themes varying from #StopRussianAggression and #FreeSentsov to critique on Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline project and 2018 FIFA World Cup get their own moments in the spotlight and after a while they hand over the space to other issues. As with all of the ambassadors, Olefirov's tweets indicate his goodwill towards the Finnish people. He emphasizes that Ukraine and Finland are on the same side, and differing opinions are only shown once in his tweet on January 16, 2018: "*As of today, I would name only one issue where the 2 countries' views are opposite: Finland looks at #nordstream2 as a commercial project. Ukraine considers it pure political & very harmful for European energy security*" (Olefirov, 2018a). Showing that Ukraine and Finland are like-minded is central to Olefirov's rhetorical ethos. He often cites the official statements of the Finnish government and shares quotes from Finnish newspapers. While he tries to create identification with the Western countries, he also seems to be left alone by the diplomatic community. When other ambassadors celebrate the 2018 FIFA World Cup in Russia, Olefirov tries to set a shadow over the hosts. Depicting Ukraine as a victim might appeal to his own followers, but the general public may lose the plot as the critical remarks are overshadowed by the massive amount of hype around the sports event. As for rhetorical ethos, Olefirov seems to be powerless in front of the crowd movements and is set to play the ultimate martyr character among the ambassadors. Whereas the other ambassadors clearly posit themselves as Agents, Olefirov can be described as a Partisan.

The British Ambassador to Finland, Tom Dodd (@TomDoddFCO1) addresses the troublesome relations with Russia with a less personal approach. However, he is the only ambassador with Olefirov to mention Crimea and Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 in his tweets. Dodd's criticism towards Russia concerns principally the Salisbury incident, cyber attacks and the breaking of international rules. His overall approach on the issues with Russia seems to be humane and his expressions of goodwill are probably best embodied in his tweet on March 25, 2018: "*Signing*

#KemerovoFire condolence book at Russian Embassy Helsinki. My sympathies go to all the families of the victims and the people of #Kemerovo #UK has no quarrel with the Russian people only with the actions of their leaders @ukinfinland” (Dodd, 2018). Dodd is painting a picture of the United Kingdom as a virtuous and law-abiding nation, and depicts himself as a rational diplomat who gets behind the rules-based system and the international community, whereas Olefirov seems to be showing more of his emotional side.

As Dodd emphasizes the need for unity of the international community, especially for Europe, he faces a contradiction resulting from the current state of affairs with respect to Brexit. Brexit-related messages form a substantial part of Dodd’s tweeting. In those tweets he lays the groundworks on post-Brexit relations between the UK and Finland. In here, Dodd appears to play a part of a bridge builder who looks into the future, and is using this position to prepare the public for what is coming. To summarize the ethos created by Dodd and Olefirov, while they both seem to build their strongest statements on the division between those who stand with Russia’s acts and those who are against them, the former seeks identification with the international community and the latter seems to emphasize identification with the Finnish public. This might result from the fact that Finland is already more politically aligned with the UK than Ukraine through various international institutions.

In 2018, the Swedish Ambassador Anders Ahnlid (@AndersAhnlid) was probably the most active relational tweeter among the ambassadors. The persona that is created through the flow of relational tweets suggests that Ahnlid is the archetype of a busy diplomat. Meetings after meetings, and he never forgets to thank. Thus, an ethos of diplomatic practical wisdom is created. These actions also highlight the close relationship between Finland and Sweden. Ahnlid tweets in three languages: English, Finnish, and Swedish. With the Swedish tweets he may speak to the Swedish-speaking population of Finland in a manner that the other ambassadors may not, at least not with the same inherency. Language is not the only factor that creates identification. On July 9, 2018, Ahnlid says that he is practically one of the Finns: *“Glad to be back in #Kotka where my father, Börje Ahnlid, grew up in the late 1930s, on Keskuskato, and enrolled in the Swedish school (Kotka Svenska Samskola), while my grandfather led a box-factory on #Tiutinen”* (Ahnlid, 2018). This tweet was also among the most favored ones of Ahnlid’s tweets.

The other ambassadors do not seem to be able to reach the same level of closeness, even though the Ambassador of Mexico, Ernesto Céspedes (@EmbCespedes), and the Ambassador of Malaysia, Dato’ Blanche Olbery (@Bolbery), are also actively sharing their experiences in Finland. As for Ahnlid, there is also the personal background and, of course, the intertwined histories of Finland and Sweden, which he also refers to, that are supporting the creation of a persona that closely relates to the Finnish public. However, it is worth to mention that Olbery’s tweeting seems to be less calculated compared to some other ambassadors, and at times it might enhance her authenticity. This can be seen, for instance, in her reply to user @LauriBambus on March 8, 2018: *“Guess what today I have 3 programmes on Women Leadership & Empowerment so a very busy day”* (Olbery, 2018a) – again, manifesting an ethos of diplomatic practical wisdom; and in her tweet on December 9, 2018: *“Finally found my time for #becomingmichelle @MichelleObama a book everyone can relate to in some point of our lives with a challenge to all of “who are we and who do we want to*

become"? Happy Reading" (Olbery, 2018b). Similar observations can also be made on the Ambassador of South Africa, Jolene Smidt (@jolene_smidt).

Trade promotion seems to be an important objective for many ambassadors. This becomes particularly well visible in the tweets of the Kazakh Ambassador Murat Nurtleuov (@Nurtleuov), the Mexican Ambassador Céspedes, and the Dutch Ambassador Cees Bansema (@CeesBansema). What separates the first from the other two is how they position themselves on business matters. While Bansema and Céspedes constantly emphasize the possible benefits for all participants, thus, building on goodwill, Nurtleuov seems to focus on highlighting the business opportunities in Kazakhstan and the Kazakh expertise.

To summarize the aspects related to rhetorical ethos in ambassadors' Twitter use, most ambassadors seem to have a tendency to act as Agents, or more accurately, as agents of goodwill. Nevertheless, a sort of diplomatic practical wisdom is also portrayed as they describe their busy professional life. Virtuous aspects surface as the ambassadors partake conversations that deal with value-based issues, such as human rights. It appears that they all follow the guidelines of proper conduct. None of them seems to pursue strong divisions, although there are some disagreements that are manifested. As for the tweets that concern negative issues between states, the ambassadors seem to act as advocates for their own countries only. There is a lack of heroic statements that would honestly demonstrate the support provided from one state to another. While diplomatic protests may not be expected from the embassies and ambassadors on their Twitter accounts, there seems to be some room for that. However, the lack of protest behavior might result from the general assumption that the political situation in Finland does not call for doing so, at least not on Twitter.

CONCLUSION

Relational and self-presentational goals seem to be more common than instrumental ones in embassies' and ambassadors' Twitter communication. This result suggests that they have been given a secondary role (secondary goals; see Dillard, 2004) in the public diplomacy discourse. Nevertheless, this does not imply that their efforts are meaningless. However, embassies and ambassadors may face considerable challenges as they communicate on Twitter. Given the relatively low number of followers of the Twitter accounts that are in the focus of this study, the embassies and ambassadors could be referred to as a kind of birds on a wire. These foreign birds do seem to have some important songs to sing, and they do so by tweeting constantly. Otherwise they would not do so. They try to get their voices heard in an environment full of noise, along with thousands of other voices. The publics that go past them might not understand what they want to tell us or may not even hear them properly.

Still, those who stop for a while and listen to these birds may notice that the songs tell us many things. First, they serve as conveyors of cultural promotion. This task seems to be primarily assigned to the embassy Twitter accounts. Second, they transmit reports on the relational aspects of state-to-state affairs. They tell the publics at home and abroad who are taking part into the process of building relationships and how is this process operated, and simultaneously contribute to the personal ties between the people in the diplomatic community. Third, they inform the publics

about the political stances of states on a variety of issues. Nonetheless, ambassadors and embassies are facing a great challenge in their influencing efforts because they have to share the same space with so many others. Yet, in its entirety this study provides a versatile summary of a rapidly emerging way to conduct public digital diplomacy. Communication goals, as the guiding framework, provide a good way to illustrate the different functions of diplomatic tweeting. Goal selection may be connected to the questions, which audiences are addressed and what is the overall objective of public diplomacy. Regarding the central topic of this book, artificial intelligence, it remains to be seen if the AI solutions can provide a similar magnitude of relational tweeting, for instance. For now, the ambassadors, with their personal accounts, may benefit significantly from the possibility to build on personal rhetorical ethos. On the practical level, thus, this study gives reasons for the public diplomacy practitioners to think on the different possibilities of having both active institutional and personal accounts on social media.

To conclude, there are some limitations to this study. First, the analyzed data is limited to Finnish, English and Swedish tweets sent by the embassies and ambassadors. Thus, some of the tweet material that was probably directed to other publics than the Finnish one was included in the analysis on native speakers of English and Swedish, but not with the others. In addition, retweets were not analyzed in this study. Second limitation concerns the method of analysis. Communication goals theory is originally focused on interpersonal communication, and it is not certain how well it fits into the analysis of communication that is related to international affairs. However, considering the significant overlapping of the three communication goals (see Canary & Cody, 1994) and the the six functional categories of public diplomacy (see Fitzpatrick, 2010, p. 89), and that there was only a relatively low number of tweets that were categorized as ‘other’, the application of this method of analysis is justified. As for the analysis of rhetorical ethos, it is worth to note that it relies completely on the interpretations of the researcher. Third, in quantitative analysis, statistical significance can be misleading as large amounts of observations usually result in very small p-values (see Lin, Lucas, & Shmueli, 2013).

Fourth limitation concerns the fact that some countries, for instance, the United States and Austria, also operate Twitter accounts that are more closely affiliated with international trade promotion in Finland. Countries also communicate with the Finnish public on other social media platforms. This might affect the message strategy choices done by embassies and ambassadors on their respective Twitter accounts. Finally, the applicability of the results is also limited by the fact that this study was focused entirely on Finland and the data was gathered from Helsinki-based embassies and ambassadors – although few of them are also accredited to Iceland or Estonia. The results also might be different in other political environment or in a country with unsatisfactory freedom of press.

As for the future research, the analysis method used in this study should be tested in another environment. The communication goals categories should also be linked more closely into the public diplomacy functions and their factorial structure should be scrutinized. It is also suggested that the visible linkages between ministries for foreign affairs and embassies/ambassadors in Twitter should be in the scope of research. This requires examining retweeting and taking into consideration other Twitter accounts in addition to embassies and ambassadors.

FUNDING

This research has received funding from the City of Tampere Science Fund.

REFERENCES

- Ahnlid, A. [@AndersAhnlid]. (2018, July 9). *Glad to be back in #Kotka where my father, Börje Ahnlid, grew up in the late 1930s, on Keskuskato, and.* [Image attached] [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/AndersAhnlid/status/1016187401746767872>
- Aristotle (n.d.). *Rhetoric*. (W. R. Roberts, Trans.). Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Tech 2001.
- Berridge, G. R. (2002). *Diplomacy: Theory and practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Black, J. (2010). *A history of diplomacy*. London: Reaktion.
- Broersma, M., & Graham, T. (2013). Twitter as a news source. *Journalism Practice* 7(4), 446–464.
- Canary, D. J., & Cody, M. J. (1994). *Interpersonal communication. A goals-based approach*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Clark, R. A., & Delia, J. G. (1979). Topoi and rhetorical competence. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65(2), 187–206.
- Copeland, D. (2009). *Guerrilla diplomacy: Rethinking international relations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Crick, N. (2017). *Rhetorical public speaking: Civic engagement in the digital age*. New York: Routledge.
- Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy: Taxonomies and histories. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 616(1), 31–54.
- Dillard, J. P. (2004). The Goals-Plans-Action Model of interpersonal influence. In J. S. Seiter & R. H. Gass (eds.) *Perspectives on persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 185–206.
- Dodd, M. D., & Collins, S. J. (2017). Public relations message strategies and public diplomacy 2.0: An empirical analysis using Central-Eastern European and Western embassy Twitter accounts. *Public Relations Review* 43(2), 417–425.
- Dodd, T. [@TomDoddFCO1]. (2018, March 29). *Signing #KemerovoFire condolence book at Russian Embassy Helsinki. My sympathies go to all the families of the victims and the* [Image attached] [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/TomDoddFCO1/status/979305616970866688>
- Duncombe, C. (2017). Twitter and transformative diplomacy: Social media and Iran-US relations. *International Affairs* 93(3), 545–562.
- European Commission (2012). *Special Eurobarometer 386. Europeans and their languages*. http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf. Accessed February 21, 2019.
- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2010). *The future of U.S. public diplomacy: An uncertain fate*. Leiden, NL & Boston: Brill.
- Gurak, L. J. (2018). Ethos, trust, and the rhetoric of digital writing in scientific and technical discourse. In J. Rhodes & J. Alexander (eds.) *The Routledge handbook of digital writing and rhetoric*. New York: Routledge, 124–131.
- Hallahan, K. (2015). Organizational goals and communication objectives in strategic communication. In D. Holtzhausen & A. Zerfass (eds.) *The Routledge handbook of strategic communication*. New York: Routledge, 244–266.
- Hakala, P. (2019, January 31). *Ukrainan Helsingin-lähettiläs Olefirov lennätettiin kotiin vakavan tapaturman jälkeen.* *Helsingin Sanomat*. <https://www.hs.fi/ulkomaat/art-2000005984594.html>
- Hart, R. P., Daughton, S., & LaVally, R. (2018). *Modern rhetorical criticism* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Henrique, J. (2016). *GetOldTweets-python*. [GitHub repository]. <https://github.com/Jefferson-Henrique/GetOldTweets-python>
- Kleiner, J. (2010). *Diplomatic practice: Between tradition and innovation*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Lin, M., Lucas, H. C., Jr., & Shmueli, G. (2013). Too big to fail: Large samples and the p-value problem. *Information Systems Research*, 24(4), 906–917.
- Lowy Institute (2018). *Global diplomacy index*. <https://globaldiplomacyindex.lowyinstitute.org/>
- Löffelholz, M., Auer, C., & Srugies, A. (2015). Strategic dimensions of public diplomacy. In D. Holtzhausen & A. Zerfass (eds.) *The Routledge handbook of strategic communication*. New York: Routledge, 439–458.
- Manor, I. (2018, January 31). Using the logic of networks in public diplomacy. *The CPD Blog*. <https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/using-logic-networks-public-diplomacy>
- Melgin, E., & Nieminen, H. (2018). *Julkisuusdiplomatia ja viestintä* [Public diplomacy and communication]. In E. Melgin & H. Nieminen (eds.) *ProComma Academic 2018 – Diplomaattinen viestintä* [Procomma Academic 2018 – Diplomatic communication]. Helsinki: Libris, 10–27.
- Melissen, J. (ed.) (2005). *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (2018). *Finnish missions abroad*. <https://um.fi/missions>
- Moon, S. J., & Hadley, P. (2014). Routinizing a new technology in the newsroom: Twitter as a news source in mainstream media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 58(2), 289–305.

Helsinki-based embassies and ambassadors on Twitter

- Mottl, D. (2018). *GetOldTweets3*. [GitHub repository]. <https://github.com/Mottl/GetOldTweets3>
- Mustajoki, A. (2018). Arjen diplomatiaa: voiko liika kohteliaisuus olla syynä väärinymmärryksiin? [Everyday diplomacy: can too much politeness lead to misunderstanding?] In E. Melgin & H. Nieminen (eds.) *ProComma Academic 2018 – Diplomaattinen viestintä* [ProComma Academic 2018 – Diplomatic communication]. Helsinki: Libris, 50–63.
- Official Statistics of Finland (OSF) (2017). *Population structure*. Helsinki: Statistics Finland. http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2017/vaerak_2017_2018-03-29_tie_001_en.html
- Olbery, B. [@Bolbery]. (2018a, March 8). *Guess what today I have 3 programmes on Women Leadership & Empowerment so a very busy day*. [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/Bolbery/status/971716937851031552>
- Olbery, B. [@Bolbery]. (2018b, December 9). *Finally found my time for #becomingmichelle @MichelleObama a book everyone can relate to in some point of our lives with*. [Video attached] [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/Bolbery/status/1071595848834973696>
- Olefirov, A. [@AndriiOlefirov]. (2018a, January 16). *As of today, I would name only one issue where the 2 countries' views are opposite: Finland looks at #nordstream2*. [Image attached] [Tweet]. <https://twitter.com/AndriiOlefirov/status/953215684653264897>
- Olefirov, A. [@AndriiOlefirov]. (2018b, March 12). *I don't know how many tweets are enough to stop Russian's bloodshed in Ukraine, I'm crying out to stop that*. [@uacrisis (UCMC) Tweet attached] [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/AndriiOlefirov/status/973229424018571264>
- Olefirov, A. [@AndriiOlefirov]. (2018c, May 27). *Зрадофіли програли: фінал відбувся. Слава Україні. Такий фінал у такі важкі часи*. [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/AndriiOlefirov/status/1000485370667196417>
- Ott, B. L. (2017). The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 34(1), 59–68.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2015). *Affective publics: Sentiment, technology, and politics*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Pigman, G. A. (2010). *Contemporary diplomacy*. Cambridge: Polity.
- PLinFinland [@PLinFinland]. (2018, November 10). *Fiński MSZ w biało-czerwonych barwach z okazji rocznicy odzyskania niepodległości przez #Polska. Finnish @Ulkoministerio in white and red in*. [Image attached] [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/PLinFinland/status/1061355420814663680>
- Riordan, S. (2003). *The new diplomacy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Riordan, S. (2017, September 4). What is a diplomat? *The CPD Blog*. <https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/what-diplomat>
- Seib, P. (2012). *Real-time diplomacy: Politics and power in the social media era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sharp, P. (2009). *Diplomatic theory of international relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sotkasiira, T., & Riiheläinen, J. (2018). Epädiplomaattista diplomaattista viestintää Venäjän Ison-Britannian-suurlähetystön Twitter-tilillä [Undiplomatic diplomatic communication on the Twitter account of the Embassy of the Russian Federation to the United Kingdom]. In E. Melgin & H. Nieminen (eds.) *ProComma Academic 2018 – Diplomaattinen viestintä* [ProComma Academic 2018 – Diplomatic communication]. Helsinki: Libris, 95–108.
- Twiplomacy (2018). *Twiplomacy study 2018*. <https://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2018/>
- Twitter Inc. (2019, February 7). *Twitter announces fourth quarter and fiscal year 2018 results*. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/twitter-announces-fourth-quarter-and-fiscal-year-2018-results-300791624.html>
- Watson, A. (1982) *Diplomacy: The dialogue between states*. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Zappavigna, M. (2012). *The discourse of Twitter and social media*. London/New York: Continuum.