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ABSTRACT

The world is continually hearing about the unrelenting expansion of the use of digital technologies like social media around the globe. The relevance of social media channels to diplomacy goes far beyond usage numbers. The universal use of social media has important strategic implications for the diplomatic community because it has fundamentally changed the ways that governments engage with their citizens and position themselves on the global stage. Social media has fundamentally impacted the art of diplomacy. Social media decides the size and scope of an issue and this dynamic alone has changed perceptions around the world in terms of responsibility, accountability, leadership and justice. This research argues that it is important to analyse Washington’s past and present top-level policy makers who are using these powerful new tools to connect cultures, increase awareness and advocate policy positions. The study used both primary and secondary data. The general objective of this study is to provide a comparative analysis of digital diplomacy by the Obama and Trump Administration and its influence on effective US foreign policy, with a focus on the study area of Kenyan Ministry of Foreign Affairs and US embassy in Kenya. The researcher adopted a non-probability sampling method to select samples for this study. From the study it is evident that both presidents have divergent styles on foreign policy as domestically, the Trump administration’s style is to be the anti-Obama, and a lot of people like it. The study on ‘elite perceptions’ showed that the US president is by far the most important actor in influencing foreign views of the US. His behaviour catalyzes tensions both in internal and global politics. Trump’s personal Twitter account is currently rooted deeply in US public diplomacy strategy, how the President interacts through it, how his practices have changed after his assumption of office and what networks are active throughout his period of activity. In summary, Donald Trump’s social media use is frivolous, overturning traditional wisdom and judgment in his presidential statements. He jumps from crisis to crisis, using a colloquial style in delivering messages instead of providing solid content. He is breaking the rules and this study argues whether it is good for the political communication community instead of creating a concrete foreign diplomacy. The study recommends credibility, accuracy, validity and authenticity of the user-generated content in the social networking sites are very important to protect the integrity of the any foreign policy of a country or its leader and his administration.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Diplomacy has entered a new phase. In the past, governments would spread their messages widely, hoping to reach the possible few people. Currently, these governments can address their target audiences with messages that if found compelling are re-examined and rebroadcasted over their networks (Bjola & Holmes, 2017). This offers a wider credibility and expands their reach. Digital diplomacy though social media entails creating new connections. Conversations and new discussions advance as they move through online environments. This keen listening and monitoring of diplomatic engagement is necessary (Andreas, 2015, p. 45). Currently listening in diplomacy is as essential as responding and speaking. Social media has had many impacts to users around the world by granting the audience control. Governments that want to disseminate their news cannot do so. The audience now feels like they have preferences and power to pick bits of information and pass it through society as they can also comment and share. (Archetti, 2012).

Not long-ago global leaders were very reluctant to go on social media. Back in 2007, Barack Obama was one the of the first world leaders to create his own twitter account with a very low number of state leaders and organizations reluctantly following him. Today, 193 UN member states have an established a Twitter presence (Bjola & Holmes, 2017). Social media giant, Facebook has 92 percent of these states which cater to an audience of over 356 million users (Twiplomacy, 2018). Former US Secretary of State famously termed the concept of digital diplomacy as “21st Century Statecraft” (Ross, 2011). Digital diplomacy depends on traditional
diplomacy forms to justify the technologies and 21st century networks and demographics (Bjola & Holmes, 2017). Thus, digital diplomacy is a tool that further advances a country’s foreign policy goals to levels limited by traditional diplomatic engagement of government to government.

“Diplomacy or “Twiplomacy” Has been viewed as “a form of public diplomacy as it has been used not only by officials but also millions of citizens across the globe.”

Giulio Terzi in *Twitter for Diplomacy* says, “*Twitter fosters a beneficial exchange of ideas between policymakers and civil society and enhances diplomats’ ability to gather information and to anticipate, analyze, manage, and react to event,*”

Other examples include the United States virtual embassy to Tehran in Iran established by the U.S department after the US embassy in Tehran closed. The embassy maintains similar status like other US embassies except for diplomacy (De Spiegeleire, Maas, & Sweijs, 2017).

Digital diplomacy refers to: “The use of digital technologies and social media platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram by states to enter into communication with foreign publics usually in a non-costly manner. The growing use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) and social media platforms in the conduct of Public Diplomacy” (Bjola & Holmes, 2017, p. 52). Therefore, the message does not change though the medium does.

Communications of foreign publics are now done via Facebook; Twitter and You tube channels instead of the radio.

Digital diplomacy originates from America’s efforts to deal with Al-Qaeda’s online recruitment plans and narratives (Andreas, 2015). In an attempt to reduce recruitment numbers, and counter Al-Qaeda’s narrative of holy Jihad against Western Imperialism, the US State Department migrated online and began conversing with Muslim netzines (Archetti, 2012).
Currently, MFAs diplomats and embassies focus on attracting editors, journalists, media outlets and news organizations to their diplomacy accounts. Attracting journalists is meant at improving online reach while other seek to enhance their current coverage. For instance, Russian Embassy in UK has continuously attempted to challenge Russia’s perceptions in UK newspapers. Other MFAs seek to lure media into their national brands (Bjola & Holmes, 2017). Ambassadors normally migrate to Twitter to help interaction with local press and perform press attaches. Such efforts are eminent when political crises occur, and the embassies try to influence events portrayal and issues in the press to foster reception of their foreign policies. Many government state departments in the West have championed the belief that open societies and open platforms are not only good for their own countries but for the world in general. However, they are clearly limiting factors as digital diplomacy can be a double-edged sword. Former US ambassador to Russia faced difficulties in his relationship with the Putin administration by tweeting about the protests in Moscow in 2012 (Washington Post, 2014). Similarly, former U.S Ambassador to Damascus, Robert S. Ford tweeted about the Syrian uprisings which led to a series of events that forced him to leave the country for his own safety (New York Times, 2011). Digital technologies with a focus on social media therefore work both ways and one could argue that there are instances where this tool is not the best for diplomacy (Sotiriou, 2017). However, the internet activities coupled with digital diplomacy can help project the state’s foreign policy stands to foreign and domestic audiences.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Currently most states, embassies, ambassadors, politicians and several MFAs use social media to interrelate with citizens, policymakers and officials in the context of foreign policy (Archetti, 2012). Digital Diplomacy has presented as a prime opportunity to establish prominent and stable platforms to facilitate decision making and dialogue which enhances global governance and responsiveness (Melissan, 2015). It can be easily noted that social media platforms are influential in the global connectivity. The reality is however that they can be equally threatening to diplomatic goals. If technology is ineffectively implemented, it can be both costly and harmful. Institutions and governments struggle with less effective and undeveloped platforms.

Close examination of the existing literature has revealed that the topic of digital diplomacy has been significantly researched. However, in addition to the need for researchers to keep up with digital trends, none of the literature reviewed has revealed a reliable framework to assess how effective digital media is regarding public diplomatic purposes. To adapt and manage new technology is risky. As more and more people aspire to join the digital world so will the challenges remain and increase on a global and political agenda. (Manor I., 2015). A question that remains unanswered. Has President Obama or President Trump’s administration been successful in attracting and engaging with foreign publics and domestic parties alike using digital diplomacy? This paper attempted to answer this question by making a comparative analysis of both administration’s use of new media; Twitter, Facebook and YouTube and its reception by the intended audience; foreign publics, media and the domestic public?
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The general objective of this study is to provide a comparative analysis of digital diplomacy by the Obama and Trump Administration and its influence on effective US foreign policy, with a focus on the study area of Kenyan Ministry of Foreign Affairs and US embassy in Kenya.

1.4 Specific objectives

1.4.1 To establish the effect of digital diplomacy by the Obama administration and its influence on effective US foreign policy

1.4.2 To determine the effect of digital diplomacy by the Trump administration on effective US foreign policy

1.4.3 To assess the norms and protocols of digital diplomacy that influence effective US foreign policy
1.5 Research Questions

i) What was the effect of digital diplomacy by the Obama administration on effective US foreign policy?

ii) What is the effect of digital diplomacy by the Trump administration on effective US foreign policy?

iii) What are the norms and protocols of digital diplomacy that influence effective US foreign policy?

1.6 Justification of the study

This study reached important conclusions which helped clarify diplomacy’s future at both the theoretical and applied realm. Traditional methods are now changing rapidly as technological innovations increase which raises questions on the value of diplomacy. If both challenges and advantages are assessed, one will conclude that digitalization has enhanced diplomacy in current times. The findings from this research also contributed to the thoroughly limited existing body of knowledge in the area of digital diplomacy policy and its influence on effective foreign policy and create an opportunity for other researchers to develop further research themes along this topic to fill any research gaps left by this research

1.7 Scope of the Study

The research focused only on a comparison of Trump’s administration and Obama’s administrations regarding digital diplomacy and its effect on foreign policies. Other forms of diplomacy such as the dollar diplomacy, economic diplomacy, public diplomacy and gun
boat diplomacy were not included in the study. The area of specialisation was also limited to the impact on foreign policies.

In terms of the target population, some of the interviewees did not want to make any criticisms of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or the U.S. embassy on the record simply because they viewed it as sensitive information. Therefore, the study’s findings cannot be generalized in other research areas because of its sensitivity.

Since this topic is quite novel and also the landscape of the digitalization of diplomacy is constantly changing, there was limited availability of sufficient print and online materials as this particular study had never been conducted by previous researchers in the field of diplomacy.

1.8 Definition of Terms

**Digital Diplomacy** - also “ediplomacy” or “digiplomacy”, refers to internet use and information technology to achieve and enhance diplomatic goals.

**Digital Media** - media programmed in machine-readable form. This can be viewed, modified or preserved on digital electronic devices.

**Diplomacy** - the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of states which depicts sensitivity and tactfulness in dealing with people.

**Diplopedia** - the Encyclopaedia of the United States Department of State which runs on an internal Intranet, called "Open Net" and houses “a unique collection of information pertaining to diplomacy, international relations, and Department of State tradecraft”.
**Foreign Policy** - Strategies of self-interest implemented by the state for safeguarding national interests and achieving objectives at the international relations level.

**Global Connectivity Index** A complete guideline for industry leaders and policymakers to pave way for digital economy.

**Hashtag** – “A word or phrase preceded by a hash mark (#), used within a message to identify a keyword or topic of interest and facilitate a search for it. Whenever a user adds a hashtag to their post, it's able to be indexed by the social network and becomes searchable/discoverable by other users” (Boyd et al, 2010)

**Information and communications technology (ICT)** – “is an extensional term for information technology (IT) that stresses the role of unified communications and the integration of telecommunications (telephone lines and wireless signals) and computers, as well as necessary enterprise software, middleware, storage, and audio-visual systems, that enable users to access, store, transmit, and manipulate information.” (Khyade, 2018).

**New Media** – “forms of media that are native to computers, computational and relying on computers for redistribution. Some examples of new media are telephones, computers, virtual worlds, single media, website games, human-computer interface, computer animation and interactive computer installations” (Buller, 2008).

**Public Diplomacy** – refers to the process whereby a country or an entity seeks to build trust and understanding by engaging with a broader foreign public beyond the governmental relations that, customarily, have been the focus of diplomatic effort (Szondi, 2008)

**Retweet** – “refers to a re-posting of a tweet to share with others. One can Retweet their own Tweets or Tweets from someone else. The use of the term "RT" at the beginning of a Tweet indicates a re-post of content belonging to someone else (Boyd et al, 2010).
Search Engine: A program meant for searching and identifying items specified by the user by obtaining information from a database.

Social Media: Applications and websites which help users in sharing and participating in social networking.

Social Networking: Interaction of people via dedicated applications and websites.

Soft Power: An approach that is persuasive in international relations, that can involve cultural or economic influence.

Statecraft – “the study of political science and public administration by focusing on governing challenges and strategic choices by the leadership at the top of government”

Viral – Circulation of information, video or image, from one internet user to another, quickly and widely.

Virtual embassy – An embassy that is based online and does not have physical premises.

1.9 Chapter Summary

This thesis is organized into five major chapters. Chapter one introduces the topic of digital diplomacy, a brief overview of the Obama Trump foreign policy and the objectives to be addressed in the study. Chapter Two highlights the work of different authors and experts in the field of digital diplomacy. Here the reader is taken through the evolution of digital diplomacy and its adoption in different diplomatic institutions as well the theoretical framework linking their work to the applicability of the topic at hand. Chapter Three, explains the choice of research design and methodology used to conduct as well describing the area of study in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the U.S. Embassy both in Nairobi, Kenya. This chapter also notes the ethical considerations and limitations of time and resources for the study. Chapter
Four, presents the data and results obtained from the study while Chapter Five discusses these findings followed by a conclusion that is representative of the overall objectives of the study was composed together with relevant and viable recommendations
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter highlights literature gathered from other authors in relation to influence of digital diplomacy on effective U.S. foreign policy. The chapter begins with addressing the theoretical framework behind digital diplomacy. The chapter then looks at literature highlighting the use of digital diplomacy by both the Trump and Obama administration and the effect on U.S. foreign policy.

2.2 Theoretical Literature Review

Digital diplomacy is a combination of many disciplines like communication studies and international relations, integrating the purpose of the public diplomacy and digital information tools. It is a challenging effort when setting the right ‘lenses’ or perspectives for analyzing this matter theoretically.

The research study questions are not covered in any literature disciplines despite being conceptually and practically part of them. Therefore, it is worth including various theoretical elements to logically address the research questions. To that end, this research relied on a set of theoretical concepts derived from the science and technology theory, international relations theory and research on regional governments in international relations. From this, the research considered two theoretical concepts; the soft power theory and the track two diplomacy model (Bohmelt, 2010).
2.2.1 Theoretical Framework: Soft Power

A discussion of soft power theory is critical in understanding digital diplomacy. The theory was founded by Joseph Nye, Jr (2011; 2010; 2008; 2004). Namely, soft power is the underlying element of public diplomacy and therefore should not be excluded when analysing digital diplomacy consequently. Nye defines soft power as “the ability to affect others through the cooperative means of framing the agenda, persuading, and eliciting positive attraction in order to obtain preferred outcomes” (Nye, The Future of Power in the 21st Century, 2011). Data sharing is a key element of digital diplomacy which enable state leaders like Obama and Trump to elicit positive reaction from a domestic and foreign audiences alike. Melissan, (2017), reassures "the importance of `soft power' and its implications for contemporary statecraft"

The concept of soft power is broadly used, accepted, and its relevance stretches further to many authors which have justified its theoretical relevance in public diplomacy theory (Nye, Cyber Power, 2010).

Digital diplomacy is an example of a critical soft power tool in the foreign policy arsenal for both President Obama and President Trump’s administrations and reflects a changed and changing world which is characterized by growing social networking and a communications and technology revolution that has profoundly reduced the distance between and among the peoples of the world (Archetti, 2012).

This means that good diplomatic relations and image between USA and countries like Iran is brought by adhering to appropriate diplomacy norms and values such as rationality, respect and mutual understanding. During Obama’s administrations, such relations were advanced through the smallest opportunities available that could ease complications. Social media
diplomacy was affected by a collaborative and clear approach. Donald Trump initiated and represented a paradigm shift in deployment of digital diplomacy into foreign policies and also a general alteration of political parties. While Obama’s administration enhanced digital diplomacy, Trump’s administration failed to do so, as he used twiplomacy as a tool for communicating personal beliefs, intentions and feelings, going against the classic diplomatic communication norms (Rucker, 2013). Digital Diplomacy is therefore a powerful tool that brings about a huge impact when utilized properly.

2.2.2 Framework: Track Two Diplomacy

Track two diplomacy comprises of informal dialogues with actors like retired senior officials, religious leaders, NGO officials and academics, who innovate new relationships and ideas which are crucial in the promotion of understanding between countries. Since it is an unofficial dialogue channel, the track level II conversations are free and frank, more open and allow participants to establish a common ground which official negotiations and representatives cannot achieve. Thus, the track II process is mainly essential when there is a break down in government level negotiations (Bohmelt, 2010). When appropriately implemented, track II dialogues can promote understanding, unity and peace by managing conflicts and bridging differences. An effective track II progress can also bring about new perspectives and idea and enable harmony between institutions, the civil society leaders and academics. Nevertheless, establishing an effective track II dialogue needs various elements to certify credibility of the discussions. It is often an underrated field of diplomacy. It is important to take into consideration, the broader informal nature of practicing diplomacy on social media. Digital diplomacy can be conceptualized under track two diplomacy. Unofficial but influential discussions on the digital platforms often contribute and inform foreign policy today as current
Policy makers pay attention to retired senior officials’ opinions and suggestions on digital platforms (Flew, 2008). Since Traditional diplomacy is called Track One diplomacy more informal dialogues involving former and current policy makers on digital platforms can be described as track two diplomacy (Chong, 2007). Communication activities that we engage in and the social arrangements that form around these technological innovations and human practices create an ensemble that is “characterized by dynamic links and interdependencies” (Flew, 2008; Lievrouw & Livingstone, 2002). This approach to investigating networks, their interactive processes, and results allows for a more holistic approach taking into consideration all factors that influence the digital sphere (Bohmelt, 2010).

2.3 General Literature Review

Jacobson (2017) asserts that even though digital diplomacy has become a critical topic; it does not have an official definition. Many organizations attempt to create a concrete definition of this new concept that is still used vaguely. Several scholars now research digital diplomacy. The attempts have been made in different ways and approaches, with a focus on all issues related to it such as internet governance, cyber security and social media. The precision deficit has also been attributed to the variant names of digital diplomacy. Scholars often use terms such as “cyber-diplomacy,” “net-diplomacy,” “e-diplomacy,” and “Twiplomacy” interchangeably.

Bjola and Marcus (2015) agree though digital diplomacy terms refer to the same thing, each prefix has a specificity of the topic and context. For example, “cyber” is attributed to security issues discussions, “e” for business issues and “twi” in reference to twitter. These terms being interchangeable add to the vagueness of digital diplomacy definitions although they appear harmless.
DiploFoundation (2016) offers a good definition of digital diplomacy, stating that it “describes new methods and modes of conducting diplomacy with the help of the internet and ICTs, and describes their impact on contemporary diplomatic practices.” Recently, political leaders and diplomats have started to acknowledge the various means of utilizing the popularity of technology for enhancing international relations and promoting international agendas. Many scholars agree digital diplomacy originated from the United States and applaud the effective means by which former state secretary Hillary Clinton shaped the foreign policy strategies by exploiting new technology. Her role in the state secretary, Clinton used the social media as a vital part of the various initiatives run by the Department of State (DOS). She sought to use social media as a statecraft tool. Clinton insisted that she wanted to run a 21st Century Statecraft Platform that would “reach beyond traditional government-to-government relations and engage directly with people around the world.” (Bjola & Marcus, 2015). DOS has developed, currently having 25 different branches, all focused on digital diplomacy, all because of Clinton’s dedication. DOS also employs over 1000 staff, working abroad and at home. Daily, the DOS uses social media to continuously monitor online posts hence modifying and adapting its messages in response to the public opinion. it also monitors feeds in over 100 languages (Zhang, 2013).

2.4 Empirical Literature Review

Many countries around the world are seizing the moment and actively pursuing their foreign policy objectives and possibilities for positive outlook through the creation of websites, blogs and the use of social media platforms—Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, You Tube, Snapchat, Weibo, Flickr, Google+. (Schwarzenbach, 2015) noted that Twitter has been quite instrumental
to foreign policy because there is greater access to databases of unfiltered information. There is also worldwide engagement irrespective of nationality and political preferences and status. Governments are nowadays being held responsible for their actions through their statements and policy regulations.

According to the U.S. State Department, (2014) the twenty-first century statecraft agenda addresses new forces propelling change in international relations that are pervasive, disruptive and difficult to predict. These distinctive features expand foreign policy: its scope, give it new tools, and change its values. Innovation is being used to solve old diplomatic challenges with new ways. Twenty-first century statecraft in this new interconnected world is therefore the combination of the use of newly innovated and adapted instruments of statecraft with technology to complementing traditional foreign policy tools (U.S Department of State, 2014).

The U.S. state department was the first foreign policy institution to launch a dedicated e-diplomacy unit, which formed the Taskforce on e-diplomacy in 2002. The taskforce is now known as the office of eDiplomacy, having over 150 full-time social media employees who work across 25 countries, half of these devoted to eDiplomacy work (U.S Department of State, 2014). The Office of eDiplomacy was formed to deal with knowledge barriers that led to the September 2001 attacks. It was also a tool for improving the State’s department ability to share knowledge and aid all communications. The State Department also has an internal version of Wikipedia called ‘Diplopedia’, which has more than 14,000 entries (U.S Department of State, 2014). There is also an equivalent of Facebook called Corridor, which has over 6,500 members to encourage internal networking. The state department also employs a crowdsourcing feature that helps resolve problems. One instance of its use was when it went
online to inquire from employees about cost-cutting ideas: a Chinese diplomat proposed that they set up a meter to monitor power usage by the US embassy claiming he suspected that the nearby residents were stealing electricity. This discovery saved high costs of unnecessary expenditure. Therefore, after 9/11, US foreign policy became more penetrative and proactive because of consistent dedication to digital diplomacy.

Other foreign ministries have also begun to embrace eDiplomacy. The UK FCO have an Office of Digital Diplomacy that is involved in a range of eDiplomacy activities (Foreign & Commonwealth Office, 2012). Sweden, through its foreign minister Carl Bildt, has gained quite the reputation of an actively innovative state in the promotion of digital diplomacy. Carl Bildt was once named “best connected Twitter leader for his effective online communication strategy” (BBC News, 2013). France, Poland, and Japan foreign ministries all rely highly on digital technologies to achieve their soft power with various collection of social media accounts. Furthermore, Germany turned to ICT platforms to crowd-source opinion and new ideas from the public that fed into its 2014 foreign policy review. Israel has also worked hard to influence the outcome of the US-Iran nuclear talks with a very active digital diplomacy unit in combination with its well-known aggressive traditional diplomacy. (Adesina, 2017).

No G8 state is also not left out in the usage of digital diplomacy. In 2011, Russia overtook Germany as Europe’s largest internet market with over 54 million monthly users and is rapidly growing. Russia is one of the very few countries where the local search engine Yandex and social network VK beat foreign rivals in free unhindered competition (Adesina, 2017).

Former Canadian Foreign Minister, John Baird, made some efforts in getting policy leaders and practitioners in Canada to embrace the online digital sphere. His November 2014, speech to the Global Commission on Internet Governance highlighted that more than 290 new social
media accounts had been created for missions abroad and departmental initiatives since January that year. This brought Canada’s digital footprint to over 100 missions around the world (Bradshaw, 2015).

A Twiplomacy study, which is an annual global survey of the presence and activity of heads of state and government, foreign ministers and their institutions on Twitter, conducted by Burson-Marsteller, a global PR firm and released in April 2015 analysed 669 government accounts in 166 countries (Twiplomacy, 2018). This survey revealed that 86% of all 193 United Nations (UN) governments have a presence on Twitter, while only 27 countries, mainly in Africa and Asia-Pacific, do not have any Twitter presence. According to the report, “Twiplomacy, (2018) revealed once again the essential quality of social media to governments and policy leaders. Social media is a crucial communication tool for diplomacy with Twitter specifically as the channel of choice for digital diplomacy. Real-world differences play out on Twitter with some embassies and foreign ministries involved in hashtag wars (Duncombe, 2017). The most followed world leader on Twitter is currently Donald Trump with his personal account @realDonaldTrump with 63.2 million followers. The official Presidential account @POTUS however has 26.4 million followers ahead of Indian’s Prime Minister, Narendra Modi with 47.4 million followers (Twitter, 2019). In contrast however current UK Prime Minister, Boris Johnson has a personal account @BorisJohnson with just 896,000 followers while the official account @10DowningStreet has 5.4 million followers. (Twitter, 2019)

According to the comprehensive Twitter list on Twiplomacy,(2018) more than 4,100 embassies and ambassadors are now active on Twitter and the list is growing daily. In London, New York and Washington, DC, foreign diplomatic missions can no longer ignore the
diplomatic activity in the Twittersphere. Even the Chinese missions to the EU, Switzerland and Japan are now actively tweeting and yet these sites are banned in their own country.

In Asia, India appears to lead the way in digital. It continues to invest heavily in building up its online reach despite resource constraints (Duncombe, 2017). Indian diplomacy officially went digital when the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) posted its first tweet in 2010 (Twitter, 2010). Ambassador Navdeep Suri, then joint secretary and head of the newly-created public diplomacy division steered the MEA in quickly becoming a digital principal within the Indian government. It used Twitter to best effect to help facilitate the successful evacuation of more than 18,000 Indian citizens from Libya during the civil war in 2011 (Manor, Kampf, & Segev, 2015). Prime Minister Narendra Modi called on Indian ambassadors around the world to “shed old mindsets” and “remain ahead of the curve on digital diplomacy”.

2.4.1 Digital Diplomacy by Obama Administration

Obama was the first president to use Twitter as he sent his first tweet in June 2009. Obama’s most retweeted tweet is a photo of him looking at young children from different racial backgrounds smiling at them through a window. This tweet was retweeted 1.6 million times and liked nearly 4.5 million times (CNN, 2017)

Twitter is the social media channel of choice for governments and foreign ministries, judging by the number of governments on the platform. Burson-Marsteller’s research team identified 856 Twitter accounts belonging to heads of state and government, and foreign ministers in 193 countries, representing 93 percent of all UN member states, with a combined audience of 356 million followers (Twiplomacy, 2018).

During the revolution in the Arab world, the State Department spent more than $600,000 on social-media ads trying to increase foreign viewership of the department’s Facebook pages.
But according to the US Inspector General’s report (2013), the effort had limited success: Just 2 percent of users shared or liked what they read in a given week. The episode illustrates the difficulties that the U.S. government has long faced in trying to sway public opinion abroad (Office of the Inspector General State Department, 2013).

The Obama administration launched a strategy aimed at revamping America’s “digital diplomacy” efforts. Secretary of State John F. Kerry hired Macon Phillips, the 2008 Obama campaign’s digital guru and the man behind many White House digital innovations, to develop ways to expand engagement with foreign audiences. A direct quote from Macon Philips highlighted the importance of use of technology: “Being able to figure out how we can connect what makes America great with foreign audiences is a great way to advance our interests,” Phillips said. “Whether that’s through virtual opportunities or through brick-and-mortar locations, we have to evaluate what’s the most effective based on the audiences we’re trying to reach and the goals we have.”

Phillips took over the Bureau of International Information Programs — also known as the government’s “propaganda arm” — at a time when disseminating messages was growing increasingly complicated. But propaganda did not work anymore, you have got to be sophisticated analysts and integrate yourself into conversations happening across platforms (Rucker, 2013). He wanted to apply the lessons of Obama’s campaign which employed microtargeting and other strategies to deliver messages to specific audiences to U.S. foreign policy. Seeing how much the world has gotten smaller, the administration saw an enormous opportunity to have a public-diplomacy strategy that’s more technologically driven, more adroit, more personal (Rutere, 2013).
For years, the State Department had been trying to influence foreign audiences digitally with mixed results. During the George W. Bush administration, Secretary of State Colin Powell, a technology aficionado, invested in new tools to reach foreigners with messages in their own languages. His successor, Condoleezza Rice, used technology to communicate with people trying to advance democracy movements (Rucker, 2013). It is not a panacea at all, but even skeptical audiences watch what the U.S.A does and listens to what their government says because of the nature of their place in the world (Rucker, 2013).

Clinton recruited her own digital hotshots to Foggy Bottom. Through social media, they raised $40 million to help victims of the 2010 Haiti earthquake. A study by Deloitte and the Partnership, (2012) for Public Service rated the State Department as having the most innovation-friendly culture of any Cabinet-level agency. But much of the department’s top digital talent moved on: Katie Jacobs Stanton went to direct international strategy at Twitter, Jared Cohen moved to Google Ideas and Ross focused on writing a book (Deloitte, 2012).

Practical interactions taking place on Twitter are transforming what is known to be acceptable communication strategies by diplomats. Twitter revolutionised the spread of information by decentralising it, because anyone with a Twitter account can create, receive, and spread information instantaneously. This has made Twitter an excellent platform to watch news unfold around the world, often in real time, and to comment on events. Decision-makers, citizens, and diplomats are using the platform to follow local and international news stories. For politicians and diplomats, the goal became to recruit as many followers as possible.

The example of the use of Twitter by embassy personnel under US Ambassador Michael McFaul’s serves here as an illustration of the impact of Twitter on public diplomacy conducted.
at the frontline. Before being sent to Russia from January 2012 to February 2014, Michael McFaul, a Stanford University professor had little experience with social media. McFaul was adamant about focusing his efforts on the rise of social media diplomacy, arguing that it offers ‘a fast way to get out information, correct the record and engage Russians (New York Times, 2014). In a context of increased tensions between Russia and the West, Ambassador McFaul was a supporter of the Obama administration’s ‘reset’ policy with Russia. Faced with a decrease of US popularity among Russians in the midst of tensions with Russia, and with the Kremlin’s tightening control of the media, the US Embassy in Moscow was looking for other ways to reach the people. A pioneer in social media diplomacy at the frontline, Ambassador McFaul soon adopted a multilingual and multiplatform social media strategy for instance, he used YouTube to introduce himself directly to the Russian people (Cull, 2013).

With the novel perception of social media, McFaul, in two years has drawn at least 13,000 Facebook followers and 70,000 on Twitter. Across the years, McFaul has utilized his social media pages to react to numerous events in Russian news streams and most prominently the sentencing of punk rock group “Pussy Riot,” the manner in which Edward Snowden was granted asylum in Russia, cancellation of Moscow Summit by the White House, key human rights cases, and the disagreement between Russia and the U.S in regards to how to respond to the chemical weapons attacks in Syria (Washington Post, 2014).

Twitter progressively became a central platform for public bilateral exchange. For instance, in May 2012, McFaul highlighted in a speech to students at the Moscow’s Higher School of Economics the role of the Russian government in pressing the Kyrgyz government to force US forces out of an air base (McFaul, 2018). In response, the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, launched a Twitter offensive, accusing McFaul of ‘meddling’ in Russian affairs in nine
successive tweets. The ambassador tried to ease the tensions, explaining on Twitter that his talk was actually focused on improvements in US-Russia relations. As a result of these tensions, the Swedish Foreign Minister Carl Bildt sent a tweet commenting that the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs had launched a ‘Twitter war’ against McFaul, writing: ‘that’s the new world: followers instead of nukes,’ (Twitter, 2012)

In the past, ambassadors were plenipotentiary because they were given full powers to engage the country and their own governments. The letters of credentials ambassadors present to their host country upon arrival still describe them as plenipotentiary. Today this provision is purely symbolic, as they no longer actually use their power to bind their government without first consulting their headquarters (Bjola & Holmes, 2017). If anything, the opposite logic seems true: modern communication technologies and the ease of transcontinental travel allow decision-makers at home to directly interact with their foreign counterparts, effectively sidestepping their ambassadors (McFaul, 2018). In these cases, the latter do not even broker cooperation or serve as initial intermediaries.

The case of McFaul’s use of Twitter shows that new communication technologies empower frontline diplomats in novel ways. In a manner that contradicts other trends, as Manor explains, the dynamic at work ‘has once again altered the role ambassadors play in diplomacy. This is due to the fact that power is now migrating back from the MFA to the embassy.’ He continues: ‘Embassies have reasserted their importance in the fields of public diplomacy and image management’, because ‘digital tools have substantially increased an embassy’s ability to communicate with the population of a foreign country, to create relationships with key audiences and elites and to manage their country’s image’ (Manor & Segev, 2017).
Faced with questions of relevance of their traditional trade, political sections in embassies have switched to new roles over the last decades. They are more directly involved than before in the promotion of their country’s values and interests through engaging with the civil society and non-state actors of their host countries. Missions directly engage with foreign audiences through public speech making, media interviews, interactions with civil society, and cultural exchanges. Ambassadors and embassy personnel supplement their interactions with the public through various social media sites like Twitter and Facebook, which can attract thousands of followers. This new form of social media diplomacy is increasingly important in countries like Russia, where government censorship over political ideas and events is tightly controlled. News events, policies, and even ideologies become harder to control. The speed to which social media travels cannot be ignored; especially in the face of the slower press releases and news conferences that take longer to be addressed by traditional media or are not even acknowledged (McFaul, 2018). As a consequence, the use of Twitter has come to be seen as a standard practice in embassies. Diplomats now commonly receive training and instructions on how to manage official and personal social media accounts in foreign postings. Diplomats and their MFAs have started adapting institutions and practices in order to integrate these technologies and not fall behind in the diplomatic game. With digital diplomacy comes both policy innovation and institutional adaptation (Bjola & Holmes, 2017).

2.4.2 Digital Diplomacy Application

The former U.S. President Barack Obama who was the uncontested political leader of the digital world, P U.S. Since his departure, President Donald Trump (@realDonaldTrump) with over 60.5 million followers on Twitter handle account took over leadership of the United States. Pope Francis, twitter handle (@Pontifex), comes second in the list of the most followed
leader of the world by citizens on his twitter account, with approximately 33.7 million followers in nine accounts of different languages. Donald Trump is the best example for using Digital Diplomacy, even some named his online diplomacy as “Trump Twitter Diplomacy”. During the 2016 election campaign, the number of followers of the current President Donald tripled (Twiplomacy, 2018). What is more outrageous than presuming that employees from the presidential administration find information directly on twitter? The fact that he receives replies from other important leaders, on the same platform. Trump big announcements on twitter, and the question of the day: “What has Trump tweeted today?” – became of any other foreign diplomats’ concerns (New York Times, 2019)

The early days of the Trump Administration illustrate the diplomatic challenges that may arise through the use of social media as a communication tool for world leaders. A spat earlier in 2017 over a refugee resettlement deal between Australia and the US illustrates such pitfalls of digital diplomacy (Adesina, 2017). The phone call made between President Trump and Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull triggered mixed reactions and assumption over whether or not the deal - which would resettle 1,200 refugees from Australia to America - was discussed. US officials’ response was inconsistent, before the publication of an article by the Washington Post revealing that the deal was a topic of tension during the call (New York Times, 2018).

Later that day, President Trump tweeted “Do you believe it? The Obama Administration agreed to take thousands of illegal immigrants from Australia. Why? I will study this dumb deal!”. Likely fearing disruption to US-Australian relations, Senator John McCain immediately came out in support of the alliance, revealing fractures within the US government between Trump’s tweets and establishment foreign policy positions. The impact of this on US-
Australian relations was minor, however greater challenges such as the threat of nuclear war are also heightened due to the President’s foreign policy tweeting (New York Times, 2019). In 2017 President Trump, displayed on Twitter a lack of coherent strategy towards mitigating the threat of North Korea and the role China plays in this security dilemma. The President responded to recent nuclear escalation from North Korea by criticizing China for their inaction, to excusing China and Chinese President Xi Jinping for their failed attempts at assisting with North Korea, to again expressing disappointment at China’s inability to prevent North Korea’s most recent nuclear test. This culminated in Trump undermining Secretary of State Rex Tillerson’s attempts at engaging in diplomatic talks with Kim Jong Un’s government on Twitter. Besides the potential for inconsistency being equated as incompetence, these tweets, which must be taken as official statements of the President, raise significant questions about American foreign policy. (New York Times, 2018)

The potential divergence between the positions articulated on President Trump’s Twitter account and the positions adopted by the US government presents interesting questions (Bryant, 2019). How can the two be structurally reconciled? And how should other countries deal with this? In the first year of President Trump’s tenure most of the trajectory of US foreign policy was influenced by the President’s Twitter account.

The appearance of inconsistency between the President’s opinion and his administration’s apparent policy has caused allies and enemies alike to question the coherence of US foreign policy. There is no simple solution to this dilemma; Congress cannot simply start executing the President’s foreign policy as communicated on Twitter in the same way as if it were developed through public diplomacy. To do so could result in implementation of policies that
ignore the institutional knowledge of the foreign policy and security establishments, as well the full implications of such policies on domestic interests (Qing, 2017).

And yet, inaction on the part of Congress could prove to be just as detrimental. Traditionally hostile states like Russia and North Korea will view discrepancies between the President and his government as an opportunity to strengthen its own well-defined foreign policy interests, while partners will be uncertain of where they stand with the United States (Koenig, 2014). Allegations of President Trump and his associates’ ties with Russia continue develop, and the Presidents’ tweets oscillate between denying Russia’s involvement in the 2016 election campaign to foreign policy achievements made in partnership with Putin, the disunity between the White House and Congress has continued to project weakness to foreign powers. Thus, America’s lack of credible commitment has undermined its ability to project power through signaling (Manor & Segev, 2017).

Second, and following from this, diplomats face increasing difficulties in their posts. The uncertainty as to what constitutes official state policy, and the sporadic nature of President Trump’s tweets mean maintaining inter-state relations and negotiations in line with US positions at an individual- and domestic-level will be restricted. For allies who tie their policies to the US, it will be difficult in this presidency to gauge US policy and therefore difficult to set their own policy. Australia’s China policy, which has remained largely non-committal, and fluctuates between attempts to foster economic growth and maintaining close relations with the United States, reflects the difficulties in coordinating with an ally who is uncoordinated. There is something to be said for using Twitter to protect and further the national interests of states as a new communication form through which diplomacy and international relations may be conducted. The immediacy of the medium provides an
opportunity for politicians to communicate complex subjects like foreign policy in an accessible way (Adesina, 2017). If digital diplomacy is to follow the current trajectory, however, it is likely to create new challenges for public diplomacy.

2.4.3 Norms and Protocols of Digital Diplomacy

Over the last decade, social media sites have been used by the State Department as the most reliable platforms to counter extremist narratives, pass and obtain information from foreign members of the public and in shaping the diplomatic agenda of the world. Remarkably, social media is useful to the State Department in managing the image portrayed by America to the world (U.S Department of State, 2014). The necessity to proactively regulate America’s image in social media platforms became ostensible under the rule of the 43rd US president George W. Bush. Multiple factors such as the annexation of Afghanistan and Iraq, George Bush’s doctrine that “you’re either with us or with the terrorists” and the refusal by his administration to join the Kyoto protocol contributed to a series of crisis in the Brand America. Regardless of the impact of the September 11 attacks on US soil, the world regarded the United States as a greedy, militaristic and opportunistic state, rather than an inspiration of democracy.

After Barack Obama became the president, a good opportunity for rehabilitation of the Brand America materialized and would be facilitated by the social media. The first attempt by Manor and Dr. Elad Segev was made by the State Department through Facebook in December 2013 to renovate the American image. The attempt by the State Department to contruct US’s self-description and the fact that social media depictions are regarded as Selfies, the attempt was perceived as an image management of Facebook, commonly known as “Selfie Diplomacy”. Any act of Selfie Diplomacy is not lightly taken especially in an era during which images rule supreme, the national images are regarded as vital foreign policy assets. Whenever nations are
deemed to adhere to values and norms, there is a diminish opposition expected to their foreign policies. Conversely, when states are deemed to fail to adhere to such norms and values, the least they should expect is a considerable resistance towards their rules from both state and non-state agencies. National imageries are also used to entice foreign investors, securing new trade partners and in joining multilateral organizations. Thus, national images are key components of the Soft Power (Manor I., 2015). From the analysis, it was discovered that US’s digital diplomacy norms of 2013 was made up of three themes. The first them depicted efforts made by the US to reconcile with the Muslim world by acting as intercessor of peace between Palestine and Israel. The second theme encompassed the moral leadership of America including calls for democratic modifications in foreign countries. The third theme depicted the economic leadership of the US through foreign relief and its efforts towards clean energy innovations. The work of the State Department by the results. It successfully branded US as in branding America “as an economically responsible superpower, guided by moral values and committed to diplomacy and building meaningful relations with the Muslim world” (Manor, Kampf, & Segev, 2015).

Manor returned to America’s Selfie in 2016 to investigate the success of the Obama State Department in constructing an unswerving online American image. Although the digital norms and diplomacy in the US were similar, they exhibited three differences. To begin with, the State Department enunciated the ideals that regulate the US foreign dogma, religious lenience, dialogue and multi-culturalism.

Secondly, the War on Terror ceased to be seen as an American endeavour and instead was perceived as a global agenda. The US was in a war against Daesh among other actors as hosts such as the Global Coalition, faith-based organisations NGOs and the UN Security Council.
Indeed, America had begun to adopt a multilateral diplomacy which replaced the unilateral diplomacy. Eventually, people started viewing America from a different perspective; a nation that was devoted to a new strategy of rendezvous which was manifested during the nuclear agreement with Iran which reinstated ties with Cuba (Manor & Segev, 2017).

After president Donald Trump was elected as president in 2016, another opportunity for evaluation of the digital diplomacy portrayed by the State Department on Facebook materialized. Such an analysis would be helpful in shedding light on the strategies used by the American diplomats in promoting Trump’s administration combative “America First” foreign strategy among international audiences. Furthermore, the study can be used to investigate the difference between the image portrayed by Trump’s leadership from that portrayed by Obama and to what extent. In an effort of characterizing America’s norms and guidelines, Manor (2017) referred to the Facebook profile of the State Department and focused on the posts posted in 2017 July and categorized them into four primary themes.

The first category depicted Trump’s administration of the US as a universal arbitrator. Post under this category focused on the mediation efforts made by the US during; the Gulf conflict with Qatar; the Ukrainian crisis; and the reconciliation talks between Palestine and Israel. A vivid difference between Trump’s administration from Obama’s was depicted by fact that America is deemed to be working alone under Trump. The mediations made by the US do not include other partners and does not rely on alliances with non-state actors. Besides, most post portrayed America’s mediation as among the contributors of global and local financial interests (Manor & Segev, 2017).

The second category focused on war and terror. All post under this theme entailed information about the liberty of Mosul from ISIS and the attempts made by the Global Coalition to stop
ISIS recruitment and financing. The State Department in 2016 however illustrated the Global Coalition as a novel alliance between the US and the Arab world such as Qatar, Jordan and the UAE. Conversely, the State Department under Trump’s did not recognize the contribution of the Arab countries in the coalition. Faith based organisations and non-state actors were also not included by the American endeavour (Manor & Segev, 2017). Iran was among the most referenced country by the State Department. Multiple posts depicted this country as a global exporter of terrorism and also as a destabilizing agent. Although the State Department made it clear of the compliance of Iran with the established deal, it argued that Iran was undermining the consensus through various terrorism affiliated activities. However, during the reign of president Obama, Iran was not negatively depicted since the digital policy the emphasized the commitment of the US in engaging Iran in a productive dialogue as per the policy of a broader “diplomacy first” policy (Manor, 2015)

The third category included posts demonstrating America’s moral leadership through US foreign aid projects to fight Ebola and increase food security; academic exchange programs; visits by foreign journalists to American newspapers and denouncing the persecution of human rights’ activists in China (Manor, Kampf, & Segev, 2015). Notably, the State Department chose not to identify the values that the Trump administration will champion. Indeed, the depiction of the US as a nation that leads by example could not be depicted among other issues championed by the State Department under the leadership of president Obama such as multi-culturalism and religious tolerance.

The final theme highlighted America’s financial leadership and the need to reform financial markets. Posts focused on bi-lateral financial initiatives, such as joint American-Turkish gas explorations, or multi-lateral initiatives such as the US-EU open skies agreement that reduce
government intervention and allow economic expansion. Finally, visits by Secretary of State Tillerson to the Middle East were also portrayed as contributing to the financial prosperity of America (Manor & Segev, 2017).

The existing American digital diplomacy policy in US is established on a novel vernacular. The word “engagement” was intensively used by the State Department in 2016, unlike in Trumps’ State Department that references the word “sanctions.” Multiple foreign challenges were to be solved using financial sanction including Syria, Venezuela, Sudan and Iran. Besides, whereas Obama’s administration focused on a climate-oriented economy, Trump’s administration has not referenced any interest on the problematic issue of globalization and climate change and its impact on the environment, with only one reference towards global sustainability. It is worth noting of the dominance of President Obama in State Department as compared to that of President Trump (Adesina, 2017). Trumps comments were full of complements of the current digital diplomacy in US since they emphasized on the need to secure borders with the Western countries and reducing government bureaucracy. Trump also touched on the ability of the Western Civilization to fight and overcome both domestic and foreign rivals.

In summary, Trump’s State Department brands America as a financial superpower dedicated to expanding its economic interests by eradicating the threat of terrorism to Western civilization and mediating global crises. American diplomacy no longer rests on engagement and dialogue but on financial stimulants and financial sanctions. This was most evident in the depiction of Iran. Above all, America now leads alone. Such norms and policies of digital diplomacy significantly differ from those exemplified during the reign of president Obama since they have no interest in restoring good relations with Muslim countries, reconciling with
former adversaries, conservation of the environment or adoption of more concerted diplomacy strategies. Although the US is still among the prominent donors in the world, it is believed that the country is not guided by norms and values. Therefore, rather than being a moral compass and leading by example, America is a fortress of solitude that seek to satisfy its own interest by securing its borders. Such a policy resonates with Trumps policy of re-installing America to what it was before; at the top (Manor 2017).
2.5 Conceptual Framework
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2.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter has covered the theoretical framework related to the study, with the theory of soft power and track two diplomacy being discussed. General literature review has discussed the issues and definitions surrounding digital diplomacy. The empirical literature review has discussed the studies conducted on the topic and all related materials, exposing the application of digital democracy by different administrations and its norms and protocols. It has also outlined the conceptual framework of the study.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Considering the topic at hand, a comparative analysis of the Digital Diplomacy used by the Obama administration to the Trump administration. It is essential that a proper research design be developed in order to lay a good foundation for the entire research process. To this effect, this chapter outlines the research methods utilised in carrying out the study. The main areas discussed are; research design, target population, sampling design, data collection instruments, data collection procedures, methods of data analysis and ethical considerations that were used.

3.2 Research Design

The chief research approach that was adopted in the conduct of this study was a mixed research design, both quantitative data and qualitative were used. The qualitative approach is an appropriate tool for a comparative analysis since it is exploratory in nature i.e. it is interested in debunking the myths behind new phenomena around the norms and protocols of digital diplomacy as used by both the Obama and Trump administration especially those accorded little or no research attention. In the process of conducting this research the researcher employed interviews, content analysis and in-depth literature reviews to thoroughly analyze the use of digital diplomacy by both administrations.

The most basic research questions are often descriptive in nature and seek to describe the occurrences of certain phenomena and how these occurrences vary between cases. For example, a study may examine how newspapers and television reports differ across two
countries, that is, Sweden and Belgium, with respect to the framing of an election campaign (Aeist & Stromback, 2010).

The justification for choosing the design is that it enabled the researcher to attempt to reach conclusions beyond single cases and explains differences and similarities between objects of analysis i.e. digital diplomacy under the Obama against digital diplomacy under the Trump administration and relations between objects against the backdrop of their contextual condition i.e. the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy.

3.3 Target Population

The population that was taken for sampling in this study was be limited to staff at the MFA and the Embassy of the U.S. in Nairobi, Kenya. Diplomats working within the Central Business District are selected due to financial and time constraints.

3.4 Sampling Design

The researcher adopted a non-probability sampling method to select samples for this study. Non-probability sampling is appropriate because it is convenient and cost minimizing for a small-scale study. While conducting this study within the Kenyan context, it is paramount that the right kind of people are included in the sample at the right time depending on their expertise thus the research employed purposive sampling in selecting respondents. The population sampled ought to have either a first-hand practical experience in the field of diplomacy or research interest in implications of the phenomena of US foreign policy. The selection also required young adult respondents as they are expected to have some years of prior exposure to
or field experience. As such a purposive sampling technique appropriately, sampled employees with the knowledge of DD and US foreign policy at the MFA and U.S Embassy.

This method was used because it is simple, easily applied to a small population and ensures particular characteristics of the study’s population that of interest, which best answered the researcher’s questions (Black, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of affairs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomats</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Showing the target population dimension*

### 3.5 Data Collection instruments

Primary data was collected through a semi-structured interview with both ended and closed ended questions of the relevant staff at the MFA Kenya and the diplomats working in the US Embassy. The interview designed for this study comprised of two sections.

The sections were different as first, the respondent’s demographic details were collected then from there the respondents were engaged in the questioning and interviewing process. The first section contained background information of the participants. The second section comprised of general then comparative questions specific to the Obama and Trump administrations to be used in this study. To minimize variations in data collection procedures, the interviews were administered personally by the researcher and her assistant. Semi-structured interviews give
respondents freedom of response while also minimizing bias and keeping the interviewer focused on the specific area of study (Kothari, 2009). Secondary data was collected through several relevant documents; Books, Journals, Periodicals, blogs, reports, case studies, social media analyst guides.

3.6 Data collection procedure

Primary data will be collected by interviewing the ministry of foreign affairs workers and workers at US embassy. Semi structured Questionnaires will also be issued. It has two sections: section A contains questions on the general information and Section B will contain questions on digital diplomacy.

3.6.1 Validity of Research Instruments

In order to be able to generalize the results beyond the confines of the experiment itself, the experiment should really reflect the situation in the real world – i.e. it should possess both internal validity (the extent to which the ideas about cause and effect are supported by the study) and external validity (the extent to which findings can be generalized to populations or to other settings). The study will be tested for both internal and external validity during the pilot study. (Nicholas, 2011).

3.6.2 Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability is described as the extent to which instruments yield measurements that are consistent each time if it is administered to same people. The researcher employed a test-retest method in order to test reliability of the research instruments. Research instruments was pre-tested on a sample of at least 10 respondents. In this study five embassy workers were given a
survey questionnaire to fill, as well as conduct pilot focus group discussion and five managers will be interviewed.

3.7 Data Analysis and Presentation

Since this study is qualitative in nature, the study employed thematic analysis strategy of primary and secondary data collected. Using this data analysis tool, the researcher categorized data into meaningful themes by looking for and identifying patterns. These themes were then subjected to a comparative analysis strategy thus enabling the researcher to draw conclusions by evaluating the implications of the data in relation to the research questions posed in Chapter 1. Furthermore, data gathered was analysed and presented using descriptive statistics such as frequency tables, pie charts and tallies. Tables and charts were used to summarize responses for further analysis and facilitate comparison.

3.8 Ethical considerations

The study complied with ethical considerations in conducting research; all participants provided informed written consent to be interviewed and demonstrate voluntary participation in the research. The participants therefore willingly participated in the study after they were approached by the researcher (Leedy, 2000; Neuman, 2000) and the research purpose and process explained to them. It was further explained to the participants that their information would remain confidential and that the specific content of individual interviews would only be discussed with the supervisor. The supervisor and the participants were unknown to each other. In the final report the identity of the participants was removed, and pseudonyms were used for the participants.
3.9 Chapter summary

This chapter has highlighted the research methods used for this research, research design, and target population, sampling technique and data collection procedures. Data collected was analysed and presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

The chapter discusses the examination and results of the study as stated in the research methodology and objectives. The findings were discussed on the effectiveness of the digital diplomacy policy used by the U.S. The research sought to answer the following questions: What was the impact of digital diplomacy by the Obama administration on effective US foreign policy? What is the effect of digital diplomacy by the Trump administration on effective US foreign policy? What are the norms and protocols of digital diplomacy that influence effective US foreign policy? The chapter discusses the demographic details and the variables. The results are based on the research objectives. Further, the results were presented in charts, graphs, and tables as suitable with illustrations being given in the form of prose. The study used mixed research design were data collected from interviews and questionnaires and data from mixed research.

4.2 Demographic Data

The study targeted 30 respondents all of which participated in the study contributing to a response rate of 100%. This response rate was sufficient and representative and conforms to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) stipulation that a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and over is excellent. This commendable response rate was due to extra efforts that were made via personal calls and visits to remind the respondents to fill-in and return the questionnaires.
4.2.1 Gender of the Respondents

The researcher sought to understand the respondents’ gender. Most of the respondents were male 67% and female were 33%.

4.2.2 Level of Position

The study sought to know the level of the position of the respondents at the US Embassy and KMFA.
The findings established that most (general staff members 55%) of the respondents were managers, 20% were from department of foreign affairs, and 10% were of supervisory level. This shows that majority of the respondents had a sound academic background to allow them to understand the effectiveness of digital diplomacy on US foreign policy. It further shows that the respondents selected were appropriate and could therefore give valid and reliable information based on their level of position in the organization.

Figure 3: Level of Respondents' Positions
4.2.3 Duration of employment at KMFA and U.S Embassy

The findings established that majority (53.8%) of the respondents had worked within their departments for 6-10 years, 23.1% for 1-5 years, 15.4% for over 10 years while 7.7% of the respondents had worked within their department for less than one year. This depicts that majority of the respondents had worked in their organizations for a long time and were

Figure 4: Length of time working at the Embassy and MFA

The findings established that majority (53.8%) of the respondents had worked within their departments for 6-10 years, 23.1% for 1-5 years, 15.4% for over 10 years while 7.7% of the respondents had worked within their department for less than one year. This depicts that majority of the respondents had worked in their organizations for a long time and were
therefore well conversant with the use of digital diplomacy between both eras of government of Obama and Trump.

4.3 Knowledge and expertise of respondents on digital diplomacy

The respondents were prompted on their understanding of the definition of the word Digital Diplomacy. All the staff interviewed consented to their knowledge and existence of digital diplomacy and usage during Obama and Trump’s tenure. The first part of the questionnaire was to query the strategies adopted by the USA government to ensure effective E-diplomacy and foreign policy. This was on a five likert-scale where Very Great Extent = 5; Great Extent = 4; Average extent = 3; Small Extent = 2; Very Small Extent = 1. The results are shown below in figure 5.
From the results above it was found that, Twitter (98%), YouTube (80%), and Facebook (60%), were the leading E-diplomacy tools adopted in by US presidents. The above tools are free and readily available on the internet which provides a large social networking base. These statistics show that both Obama and Trump through the internet are
utilizing the power of social media that are readily available and do not require any fees or extracosts.

Figure 5 also reveals that Blogs are steadily becoming unpopular since they require a lot of administration responsibilities. Unlike other social media tools such as Facebook and Twitter, Blogs require extra costs such as hosting, administrator control such as creating accounts and managing the website.

4.4 Digital diplomacy by the Obama administration in promoting US foreign Policy

The respondents were asked on effectiveness of Obama digital diplomacy.

One interviewee at the US Embassy said:

“Obama was able to figure out how to connect what makes America great with foreign audiences and how its digital diplomacy is a great way to advance our interests”. R1

Another commented:

“I think Obama was not really effective compared to current Trump administration.” R2

“for the Obama administration, the goal was not to truly democratize Digital Diplomacy. Instead, it was to use more engaging forms of Digital Diplomacy to promote American perspectives, including liberal democratic values.” R3

“I would say social sites during Obama did three things that were really important. First, it created an opportunity for people to see the world through the wisdom of their friends. The information they got was called not by some distant, remote editor, but by the opinions and ideas of their friends. Point number two is, Facebook and sites like it created a real premium on authenticity. Who are you, and how do you express who you are in a way that I can
understand it? And third, they created a whole new level of accountability, because I get to see what you care about, what you’re thinking about, and it’s not just static, but you see it over time.” R4

The respondents agreed to the fact that Obama was able to use digital diplomacy era during his tenure. Despite respondents R2 disagreeing that Obama was not effective in using digital diplomacy compared to Trump this can be noted from the fact that Trump has been able to constantly use digital platforms more than Obama did.

4.4.1 Obama use of social media platforms to foreign crisis management

The respondents were asked on how Obama used digital diplomacy.

One of the respondents said

“Effectively used social media to manage crises on foreign countries which increased favorable public opinion about U.S. involvement in other countries and legitimize U.S. foreign policy abroad”. R5

“Obama used Twitter creates a platform where he was able to resolve and talk about issues affecting other nations being the world most powerful leader at his time his tweeter post created a very huge impact in resolving issues and managing crisis” R6

Most of the respondents agreed that Obama was effective to use twitter and other form of social media in crisis management. Data obtained from the interviews was evident that the respondents felt digital diplomacy is very effective in maintaining a positive attitude towards other countries in resolving crisis. This information is in line with Schultz (2014), who
according to him “crisis communication via Twitter leads to higher reputation than crisis communication via blogs, which in turn leads to higher reputation than crisis communication via traditional newspapers.”

Nonetheless, this is only realistic with direct communication rather than secondary. Whereas social media can enhance the dissemination of false information within a short time, the platforms can also give organizations the aptitude to react to correct false information rapidly. It is critical for the American government to examine the impact and value of utilizing social media in times of crises since Embassy press offices usually handle crises management. The effective use of social media to handle crises on the international scene will increase positive public opinion about the U.S involvement if other nations and act to validate the U.S foreign policy, because citizens amplify the message in social media platforms. The application of social media platforms like Twitter develops an avenue for deliberations whereby information can be exchanged simultaneously between people, organizations, and governments. With social media as a legitimate avenue for crisis management, organizations or governments are no longer the sole source of information and people are usually the first to disseminate key updates. Social media networks give governments and organizations the tools to refine information passed in the media.

The growth of social media has changed the information space around conflict. People affected by conflict increasingly have the tools to record and share their experiences with the world and to be a part of the media through the use of a cell phone camera and internet access (Bull, 2012). Information that moves through these networks can have an impact on the course and outcome of the war by affecting public opinion and support domestically and internationally. While social media contributed to dialogue, stability, nonviolent political solutions, and
collective identity in conflict-affected and fragile states, it had adverse outcomes. Elites and others seeking power used these same tools to organize for political influence, recruitment, and political violence. Citizens too used ICTs to polarize groups, spread rumors, strengthen biases and foment violence.

Nevertheless, it can be considered to be a fact through the help of unswerving communiqué and not secondary. Despite social broadcasting increasing the blowout of falsified evidence within a short time, it also enhances firms and organizations to be responsive and clarify the data. The rise of social media has altered the data space around conflict. Individuals that have been impacted by the conflict progressively have instruments to record and share their involvements with the world with the advantages of media such as cameras, cell phones, and internet access (Bull, 2012). The information that manages to pass through such networks has experienced impacts on the outcome and course during the war by affecting domestic and international support and public opinion. Social media had adverse outcomes while it contributed to steadiness, dialogue and joint identity, non-violent political solutions in fragile and conflict-affected regions. Individuals seeking power and elites utilized the same tool in organizing for recruitment, political influence, and political violence. ICTs have also been used by civilians to spread rumors, polarize groups, instigate violence, and strengthen biases.

According to one respondent,

“crisis communication via Twitter leads to higher reputation than crisis communication via blogs, which in turn leads to a higher reputation than crisis communication via traditional newspapers.”
Policymakers and donors have designed and debated on programmes and policies in conflict the outmoded forms of broadcasting have provided a top-down passage of data. Individuals that are entitled to power within a firm have the utmost prospective to have their information and perspective printed in broadcast and the paper on the news section. For instance, the Haitian earthquake in 2010 was well handled by the power of social media controlling and distributing information. In addition to that, the utilization of social media in the moments of the crisis in the United States received support from the public for the United States presence like in the Japan scenario. When there was a presence of trust among the United States citizens, individuals that were active on Twitter had a willingness of broadcasting the message despite risks on their reputations. Foreign civilians have expected to that the United States had a conferred interest on its citizens. It was the duty of a subdivision of state digital subtlety brigadier to inspire public estimation overseas. Besides, it created a positive brand that allowed the United States relations with the host state. In host countries, the popular estimate influences the government pronouncements on major strategic decisions that are of high concentration to the United States. It was authoritative that digital diplomacy brigadiers are used to tracking twitter and other connected sites of social broadcasting to promote and engross for a positive United States brand.

4.4.2 Obama use of social media to create positive image

Respondents were asked whether Obama’s administration’s use of social media shaped a positive vision. The question was a Yes or No question. Majority of the respondents agreed that Obama use of social media fashioned an optimistic image of America as compared to other countries (88%) and 12% of the respondents did not agree that Obama use of social media created a positive image.
4.4.3 President Obama administration’s use of social media to advance US foreign policy

The respondents were asked on their thoughts on former President Obama administration’s use of social media to advance US foreign policy. This question was an open-ended question and the response of is outlined below;
One of the respondents

“*It was a very very positive former President Barack Obama has used social media to connect with voters in the United States as well as people around the world more actively than any other president this help cement his legacy on foreign policy. “* R9

"*Obama digital policy managed bringing a responsible end to this war in Iraq and refocusing on the critical challenges in the broader region,*" R10

“*Obama was the first president to exist in a rampant growing digital era and hence he used his position to extend US foreign policy to other countries “* R13

From the above response it can be argued that social media is hence transforming the viewed space whereby diplomacy occurs. Nonetheless, despite its complex nature, diplomacy continues to be seen as a space for interpersonal communication. In recent times, diplomacy’s renaissance as an academic discipline has witnessed a rise in research on its processes and the competing functions of agency and framework in its traditions and culture, examining the key duty of political leadership in enabling diplomatic progress (Sandre, 2015). Additionally, these examinations focus on the interpersonal and individual viewpoints of diplomacy, instead of examining the novel technology where diplomacy occurs. An emerging body of literature contributes to comprehending the robust role of innovation in global issues by framing cyberspace as the novel platform for conflict, highlighting the aspects of technology that pose a threat to security which entails going above terrorism and into the domain of governance. Academics like Shorters (2014) have moved beyond the notion of technology posing a
challenge to the sovereignty of states to analyze the power of social media in modern statecraft, or what is popular known as digital diplomacy.

Obama’s regime was able to solidify the application of social media in diplomacy. From digital diplomacy as the novel public diplomacy to cyberspace as the novel space for warfare, ICT is an unavoidable platform for international relations. Undoubtedly, social media platforms are part of the transformation of diplomacy (Bjola & Holmes, 2015). It is important to examine the effectiveness of this mode in creating interpersonal trust between diplomats, and if it can be an effective medium for conversation when traditional forms of diplomacy are limited or hard to use.

4.5 Effectiveness of Digital Diplomacy by The Trump Administration on Effective US Foreign Policy

The respondents were asked to rate President Donald Trump’s administrations’ use of digital diplomacy in effectively handling United States foreign policy.

Most of respondents (89%) responded that President Trump has effectively used digital diplomacy against 11% who were against. The results are represented below.
4.5.1 Digital diplomacy platforms used by the Trump Administration

The respondents were asked to rank the digital social platform that they frequently accessed President Donald Trump or his administration. From the respondents it was evident that twitter is the most dominant platform used platform as the respondents agreed to have come across at
least a tweet of President Trump daily. Twitter and Facebook tied at the same percentage of 92% while blogs and Instagram were at 5% and 6% respectively. The results are presented in the figure below.

![Rank of Digital Media Platforms used by Trump Administration](image)

*Figure 8: Ranking of Digital Media Platforms mostly used by Trump's Administration*
4.5.2 The Frequency of Trump’s use of Twitter for Diplomacy

The respondents were asked on their opinion, how has President Trump’s frequent use of twitter changed diplomacy? This was an open-ended question and enabled the respondents to give their thoughts about the subject.

“President Donald trump has revolutionized the use of social media, he is the first president we can be able to understand his thoughts everyday with his tweets, I love the fact that he is a digital president.” R6

“I don’t like how he uses twitter to respond to petty issues, I think being the most powerful he should not guard by anger, his tweets have made many people to resign from office and this has also affected relations of the United States with different countries.” R9

“Trump era is perfect... everything is digitalized, and he is able to reach anyone anywhere with his tweets and Facebook posts.” R17

From the respondents it is clear that Trump is the first American President to actively utilize his personal Twitter handle irrespective of the prevalent diplomacy strategy of the country, with a direct effect on the public policies developed by the White House and the Federal Government. The President’s Twitter handle (@realDonaldTrump) has been the primary communication mode selected by the President to state sentiment and opinion on the country’s civil society and has become the public diplomacy tool of the White House that has generated most attention in the media (Al-Deen & Hendricks, 2012).

The Twitter channel @realDonaldTrump ushers in some uncertainty since Donald Trump if the first president to completely interact with the public in such an engaging and personal
manner, by-passing the traditional modes of political communication in regards to the formality of language and the frequency of using negative language. This unpredictable behavior develops tension in both domestic and international politics. Due to this, it is interesting to gain insight how this Twitter Channel is interwoven the diplomacy strategy of the U.S., how the President uses it to communicate, how his habits have transformed after he took office and the active networks across his time of activity (Babbit, 2019).

4.5.3 Dimension of Trump Twitter strategy and Effect on U.S. Diplomacy

The researcher sought to analyze the main purpose of Trump’s twitter strategy; is it for political gains, personal branding or to promote diplomacy in an unconventional but effective way. The data used in this section was obtained from peer reviewed Journals and published articles.

![Figure 9: Analysis of Donald Trump's Twitter Strategy (Source: Elcano Royal Institute, 2016)](image-url)
64% of tweets that were accounted were associated with branding. The topic associated with international relations and public policies are less than 38% of the overall material of @realDonaldTrump. The two dimensions (personal branding and politics) are compared to great extent bus slogans and opinion dominate political activity. The peak of personal branding is from November 2016 to January 2017 due to the U.S elections and from September to October of 2017 due to Obamacare, tax reform, and U.N speech.

After both aspects were analyzed, it generated an index that was thematic of @realDonaldTrump material, developing a grouping that was ad hoc and associating each tweet to the kind of language utilized by President Trump. Formal language was comprehended as neutral and in-tune with public diplomacy settings, and informal language comprehended as slang within public diplomacy (Babbitt, 2019).

Political tweets usually include opinions on policy, not only about the activities of Trump’s Administration but also criticism aimed at the political administrations of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. @realDonaldTrump’s political dimension includes all the information that should be part of the government’s press releases and political discussion over issues in the public domain and of general interest is its goal. Under no circumstances is the US President using this channel in order to explain strategy or public policy (Babbitt, 2019).

4.5.4 Percentage Trump’s tweets on foreign policy

From the studies, it is evident that Trump’s tweets talk about foreign diplomacy as shown in the figure below adopted from IIE, 2018. The overall number of tweets were examined and unlike the aspect of public branding, which is wider notion, the topics of personal branding include opinions and slogans on Donald Trump that he duplicates on his tweets.
It is evident that most of Trump’s tweets have a direct impact on international relations. Foreign policy is treated directly and with a straightforward language where personal and political acknowledgments towards foreign state representatives are common. However, we can also see numerous sharp criticisms with a personal informal language towards political leaders from states such as North Korea and Iran (Gutsche, 2018). This is where we find a conflict between...
Donald Trump in his role as a disgruntled citizen and Donald Trump in his role as US President, as this particular activity accounts for 20% of the total and has significant international repercussions. Russia has a significant weight in these issues, which shows Donald Trump’s disposition to a positive relation with the Russian government.

4.5.5 President Trump administration’s use of social media to advance US foreign policy.

The respondents were asked on their thoughts about Trumps use of social media on foreign policy. The responses are below.

“I think its negative that’s all” R4

“Trumps tweets are mixed both positive and negative recently he was able to tweet about requesting to meet North Korea leader and through tweeter he was able to meet him I think this was a great success for Trump but generally I feel negatives outweigh the positives.” R 19

“Donald uses his tweets to express his anger against other countries and I think this has affected policies that link back to US” R 12

“Very negative it affects US policy” R 13

It is clear from the study subjects that the tweets have an impact on American foreign policy. On one hand, many critics assert that Trump’s regime will harm the well-developed liberal international order based on free trade, alliances, and multilateralism, and American endorsement of broadly mutual rules of behavior between countries. Across the decades, the participation of the U.S in this order acted to promote widely shared objectives, like democratization, human rights, and economic growth, along with arms control and global
security. The agenda of Trump’s regime places a threat to this order and those mutual objectives by focusing on a slimmer ideology of national interest. Trump utilizes a zero-sum perspective of politics based on transaction, and is clearly willing to ignore longstanding trade partnerships, alliances, and international rules (Gutsche, 2018). According to Trump and his followers, the country’s foreign policy has been poor as both enemies and allies have taken advantage of the U.S willingness to bear the implications for policies that serve the interests of other states.

It is apparent from the research that Trump is not keen in promoting U.S democracy internationally and does not have any thoughts on democracy and human rights. Indeed, he has openly queried the role of the European Union, which is dedicated to democracy and free trade and has endorsed policies that restrict the movement of Muslim immigrants and refugees. The intervention of the U.S to promote human rights and democracy has definitely not been always effective, however, it would be a significant change in international politics if the U.S became insensitive to the failure or success of states, organizations, and democratic movements (New York Times, 2019).

4.6 Comparison of Trump and Obama on digital diplomacy.

The respondents were asked to rate both Obama and Trump administrations on use of digital diplomacy. The respondents were asked to tick on the president they feel has effectively used the digital diplomacy to promote foreign policy. Most of respondents (69%) supported Barack Obama digital diplomacy and 31% did supported Obama use to promote digital diplomacy. The results are represented in the figure below.
Figure 11: Comparing Obama and Trump's use of Digital Diplomacy

The respondents were asked on their thoughts about the effect of Obama and Trump digital diplomacy affected US foreign policy respectively on their era of policy. The responses are highlighted below.

“Obama was effective in using digital diplomacy than Trump he tweeted occasionally on sensitive issues compared to Trump who tweets on any issue” R19

“Trump uses social media to express his feelings about global issues, he once put a tweet that Africa is a shit hole continent, I think he is more careless than Obama was” R16
“Obama was governed by principles, he tweeted sensible things in rare occasions hence his social media interactions did not have a major negative impact on foreign policy compared to Trump.” R14

“Trump’s tweets are arrogant and focused on self-brandy building compared to Obama who used his tweets to communicate and promoted US foreign policy” R11

From the respondents it is evident that both presidents have divergent styles on domestic and foreign policy, the style of Trump’s regime contradicts that of Obama, and many people prefer it. The research on perceptions of elite politicians shows that the American president has the biggest influence on political views on the country (other political positions in the U.S have less influence, and the processes of the U.S government are now ell understood internationally). Such viewpoints have a key impact for how America is treated and how it engages with other nations (E-diplomacy Hub: Twitter and Foreign Policy: Digital Diplomacy in Action, 2017). If there has been a feature that has defined foreign policy during trump’s regime, it is the confusion. The confusion is both in the constant gaps between the decisions made by the president and his regime and in the range of reversals and contradictions in his own opinions (McFaul, 2018).

Another feature in approach used by Trump is the in regard to world affairs is the urge to erase Barrack Obama’s legacy as well as those of his predecessors. Trump has largely been against everything that Obama supported, from the nuclear deal with Iran in 2015 to the trade deals with Europe and the climate accord in Paris (Sotiriu, 2015). The lack of trust in international organizations and agreements is the third theme of the president. Trump’s strategy for making deals features talks between two men. Round tables with several opinions frustrate him as they
force him to listen to foreigners with divergent viewpoints or less power. John Bolton was chosen as the foreign advisor mainly because he wanted to develop a bonfire of American global duties (McFaul, 2018). Indeed, Trump is yet to face the test of a global crisis that he has not created on his own. It will be interesting to see if he will continue on the same path in the next two years.

4.6.1 Methods used in measuring digital diplomacy effectiveness

Figure 12: Measuring the effectiveness of Social Media Communication
The study revealed that social media communication in the Embassy was evaluated in different ways. In response to this, (87.5%) of the respondents used the number of likes and number of comments in measuring social media communication, (75%) of the respondents used the number of retweets and number of replies in gauging social media communication, (62.5%) of the respondents mentioned the number of favorites in Twitter, (50%) of the respondents used re-linked contents shared as a way of measuring whereas (37.5%) of the respondents used the quantity of updates and (25%) of the respondents used the quality of the updates in measuring social media communication in the Embassy studied.

4.6.2 Frequency on Usage of social media sites

The frequency of measuring social networking sites in the Embassy and KMFA was another objective of the study. In the study (62.5%) of the respondents measures the social networking sites on a daily basis whereas (25%) assesses the social networking sites once a week and (12.5%) of the respondents indicated once a month as summarized in figure 13.
4.6.3 Benefits of digital on diplomacy foreign policy

The respondents were asked to rank the benefits of digital diplomacy and how they apply it in public communication. Application of social media in open broadcasting has many benefits and opportunities to the Embassy. Figures revealed significant benefits of using social media in general discussion in the Embassy. Majority of the respondents (87.5%) indicated strengthening ties between the two countries, high interactivity in the real-time, speed of delivery while (62.5%) affirmed that it enhances information sharing, promotes public engagement and provides a global visibility platform. Improving Embassy goals and
objectives, feedback from the citizens and promoting US Embassy activities was cited by (75%) of the respondents whereas half of the respondents (50%) mentioned social media communication promotes audio-visual communication.

Figure 14: Response rate on perceived benefits of using social media for Diplomacy

4.6.4 Use of digital diplomacy at the U.S. Embassy

Respondent’s response on role of digital diplomacy in influencing effective foreign policy at the US Embassy in Nairobi.
Figure 15: Use of digital diplomacy at the U.S. Embassy in Nairobi

One of the objectives of the study was to establish the norms of digital diplomacy on USA foreign policy. Social media, as an effective means for crisis communication, as mentioned by (75%) of the respondents. Over half of the respondents (62.5%) stated that they used social media communication as an alternative to news channels in case of a crisis as they are fast means of connection to the public. Half of the respondents (50%) considered it an informative tool for creating a basis for potential crisis communication and creating a functioning network in case of crises. (25%) of the respondents said they used the US Embassy
social media sites to follow developing news stories in real-time in emergencies. A case in point is the recent media rumors that were going around indicating that the Embassy was operating on minimal staff and that security had been beefed up due to terrorist activities in Kenya. The US Embassy released a press conference that was posted on its Twitter and Facebook sites with the correct information that it was business as usual at the Embassy. Recently, consular staffs were online on Facebook, answering questions from clients on any issues regarding visas, touring to the United States and the Visa application process.

Utilizing Twitter as an instrument for quick response in crises has proved to be of significance as a skill of PD. Crisis management globally commonly entails the sustenance of other foreign states, for instance, in natural disasters which necessitate pandemics and endemics. The ultimate objective of the United States department of state and United States aid international development has assisted in enhancing civilian abilities to respond and curb conflict and catastrophes. Moreover, it integrates an operative aptitude to reform the justice and security sectors in fragile states. Civilians are recognized as the first line of defense abroad by enhancing conflict response and prevention abilities through crafting a new agency of skirmish and steadiness with procedures that strengthen the services in the office of transition initiatives at USAID.

Utilizing social media sites, for instance, Twitter has enhanced the creation of a podium where information is instantaneously swapped amongst the governments, firms, and people. A social media platform has enabled firms and governments to scrutinize data shared by the media. Being an effective platform for catastrophe management, firms and organizations have been snatched the advantages of communicating first in new significant updates. Considering the
analysis of Schultz, developing crisis by the use of Twitter hints on a higher status as compared to catastrophes. It is through blogs which in turn lead to a complex status as compared to the crisis communication through traditional newspapers. The United States government should conduct an exploration of the effects and value of utilizing social media platforms in the event of a crisis. Social media has enhanced the rise of the spread of false information speedily. However, they have created rooms for firms or connected institutions to respond and clarify incorrect details with immediate effect. To use social media in managing of crises abroad increases favourable public opinions with regards to the United States engrossment in other states. In addition to that, it legitimizes United States foreign policy overseas considering that the civilians disseminate the information in social networks.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The chapter presents a summary of the results, a discussion of findings, and conclusion. Finally, it makes a recommendation and suggests the direction for future studies.

5.2 Summary of findings

This section discusses the analysis and results of the study, as highlighted in the research objectives and research methodology. The findings were presented on the success of digital diplomacy on U.S. policy. The study sought answers to the following specific research questions: What was the effect of digital diplomacy by the Obama administration on effective U.S. foreign policy? What is the impact of digital diplomacy by the Trump administration on effective U.S. foreign policy? What are the norms and protocols of digital diplomacy that influence effective U.S. foreign policy?

The study sought to establish the effect of the norm of digital diplomacy on foreign policy. It is clear from the study results that the most important social networking sites commonly used in the Embassy and KMFA for social media, communication are Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Flickr. The number of comments, retweets, replies, favorites, and linked contents was some of the methods used in measuring social media communication in both these institutions. Most of the participants, 6 out of 6, had positive thoughts about the use of social media in diplomatic efforts in the future. Two-thirds of the participants clearly articulated that the role will either become more significant or will increase. Half of the respondents, some four out of eight, believed that social media would have a strategic and critical role in the communication efforts of the Embassy and KMFA, and this will affect foreign policy positively. A few of the
respondents, two out of eight questioned stated that the growing social media platforms are the only method of maintaining close interaction with the public and that social media networking sites are relevant in communicating with the American citizens and the locals. The same number of participants recorded that social media should be increasingly planned to make it more systematic. The platform needs further development in the future through the investment of both resources and time.

The research also sought to compare influence former president Barack Obama and President Trump digital diplomacy on U.S. foreign policy. From the respondents, it is evident that both presidents have divergent styles in regard to both domestic and international policy. The style of Trump's regime contrasts that of Obama's and it appears that many people prefer it. The research on 'elite perceptions' demonstrates that the American President is mostly the most important agent that influence the perception of foreigners if the country (other political positions have much less influence, and foreigners do not well understand the processes of the American government). Such viewpoints have critical implications for how the U.S. is treated, and the manner other countries engage with the U.S. (Al-Deen & Hendricks, 2012). It is apparent that The Twitter channel @realDonaldTrump ushers in some uncertainty since Donald Trump if the first president to completely interact with the public in such an engaging and personal manner, by-passing the traditional modes of political communication in regards to the formality of language and the frequency of using negative language as demonstrated in Figure 16,17 and 18 (Twitter, 2018). This unpredictable behavior develops tension in both domestic and international politics (Al-Deen & Hendricks, 2012). Due to this, it is interesting to gain insight how this Twitter Channel is interweaved the diplomacy strategy of the U.S.,
how the President uses it to communicate, how his habits have transformed after he took office and the active networks across his time of activity.

The rise of social media has transformed the information space that surrounds conflict. Individuals impacted by conflict exceedingly have the resources to record and share what they have experienced with the world and to contribute to the media by using the cell phone camera and using the internet. The information that is passed through these networks can have an effect on the nature and result of conflict impacting public opinion and gaining support domestically and on the international scene. Whereas social media contributed to peaceful solutions, stability, meaningful dialogue, and a mutual identity in war-ridden and weak nations, it had adverse effects. Power-hungry people utilized these same platforms to arrange for political influence, recruit members, as well as plan political influence (Berridge, 2015). Besides, citizens used information technology to polarize people, reinforce biases, spread rumors, and instigate violence.

In spite of the evolution of the media environment, policymakers, as well as donors, have vigorously debated and developed programs and policies in weak states affected by the conflict based on traditional media forms. This has been prevalent with an examination of media's impact on early warning signs, reconstruction after conflicts, the stability of nations, governance, and conflict. Projects and evaluations associated with peace journalism and war reporting and reinforcement to independent media forms are also mainly based on traditional media despite the threat that has been brought about by novel innovations.

Social media platforms, especially Twitter, are key in increasing practices related to Digital Diplomacy. As a practice, Digital Diplomacy has gained a negative reputation, similar to public relations, due to the conventional top-down flow of asymmetrical information that is
the main basis of the practice (Berridge, 2015). Conventional forms of media facilitate top-down information since those that have power within institutions have the highest potential to have their viewpoints and information broadcast on T.V. news and published in newspapers. Nonetheless, as demonstrated in 2010 during the Haitian earthquake, social media enables citizens to have the authority to create and distribute information.

Additionally, the application of social media during periods of crises in the U.S. gained the support of the public. Foreigners wanted to gain insight that the U.S. was interested in their affairs. Consequently, the broadcast of accurate information during periods of crises and listening to the concern of civilians abroad developed a level of trust (Bjola & Holmes, 2015). After trust was developed and people felt part of the U.S. message, active users on Twitter were more willing to put their reputations under risk within their network to broadcast the message.

Figure 16: A sample Screenshot of President Trump tweeting U.S Foreign Policy with South Africa (Source: Twitter, 2018 https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump)
Figure 17: President Trump tweeting U.S. foreign relations with Iran

(Source: Twitter, 2018  https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump)
Figure 18: President Trump’s tweet criticising past U.S Foreign Policy Security Regulations
(Source: Twitter, 2018  https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump)

Figure 19: Trump recent tweet about Congresswoman who are immigrants
(Source: Twitter, 2019)
The rise of social media has transformed the information space that surrounds conflict. Individuals impacted by conflict exceedingly have the resources to record and share what they have experienced with the world and to contribute to the media by using the cell phone camera and using the internet. The information that is passed through these networks can have an effect on the nature and result of conflict impacting public opinion and gaining support domestically and on the international scene. Whereas social media contributed to peaceful solutions, stability, meaningful dialogue, and a mutual identity in war-ridden and weak nations, it had adverse effects. Power-hungry people utilized these same platforms to arrange for political influence, recruit members, as well as plan political influence (Berridge, 2015). Besides,
citizens used information technology to polarize people, reinforce biases, spread rumors, and instigate violence.

In spite of the evolution of the media environment, policymakers, as well as donors, have vigorously debated and developed programs and policies in weak states affected by the conflict based on traditional media forms. This has been prevalent with an examination of media's impact on early warning signs, reconstruction after conflicts, the stability of nations, governance, and conflict. Projects and evaluations associated with peace journalism and war reporting and reinforcement to independent media forms are also mainly based on traditional media despite the threat that has been brought about by novel innovations.

Social media platforms, especially Twitter, are key in increasing practices related to Digital Diplomacy. As a practice, Digital Diplomacy has gained a negative reputation, similar to public relations, due to the conventional top-down flow of asymmetrical information that is the main basis of the practice (Berridge, 2015). Conventional forms of media facilitate top-down information since those that have power within institutions have the highest potential to have their viewpoints and information broadcast on T.V. news and published in newspapers. Nonetheless, as demonstrated in 2010 during the Haitian earthquake, social media enables citizens to have the authority to create and distribute information.

Additionally, the application of social media during periods of crises in the U.S. gained the support of the public. Foreigners wanted to gain insight that the U.S. was interested in their affairs. Consequently, the broadcast of accurate information during periods of crises and listening to the concern of civilians abroad developed a level of trust (Bjola & Holmes, 2015). After trust was developed and people felt part of the U.S. message, active users on Twitter
were more willing to put their reputations under risk within their network to broadcast the message.

The effective integration of Facebook into America’s digital diplomacy efforts has developed visible engagement with its audience and created a community that will last due to Obama’s dedication to digital diplomacy.

The most important lessons from America’s experience are: Social media’s best contribution to digital diplomacy is by enhancing the reach of current processes through direct and informal communication, and developing potency for more dialogue; highlighting the correct resources to reach desired audiences was crucial for social media efforts, as was identifying its online enhances its reach beyond the target audience; strategic approach to the platforms outreach should be determined by the local setting, including creating content to motivate communication from the community and leveraging on trends in the media setting being targeted; the threat of developing harmful interactions from social media outreach should be recognized, but giving space for more communication enhances the audience interest and can develop an advantage over the competition in the target audiences; effectiveness of social media endeavors should be formed on proof of engagement with target audiences and the creation of a foundation for long-term discussion (Bjola & Holmes, 2015).

Social media’s role in digital diplomacy is best seen when it develops potential for constant dialogue and engagement. By reacting to the interests of users and careful management, a network that was created mainly because one event has the potential to become a long-standing community that holds evolving debates. Strategies for utilizing social media as part of digital
diplomacy efforts should center on developing engagement that will motivate and encourage long-term engagement.

Social media resources will likely be part of America’s digital diplomacy process for the future, but their successful usage requires a comprehension of their role in disseminating information and their aptitude to enable discussion. Utilizing sustainable discussion as an indicator of effectiveness of social media efforts was one method to enhance the understanding of policymakers and professionals about its role in digital diplomacy. Increased recognition of social media’s aptitude to develop engagement and reinforce potential for future ties was key to inspiring federal lawmakers to give social media and efforts in digital diplomacy extra funds (Manor & Segev, 2017).

5.3 Summary of results

5.3.1 Digital diplomacy by the Obama administration in promoting US foreign Policy

Most of the respondents agreed that Obama was effective to use twitter and other form of social media in crisis management. Data obtained from the interviews was evident that the respondents felt digital diplomacy is very effective in maintaining a positive attitude towards other countries in resolving crisis. This information is in line with Schultz (2014), who according to him “crisis communication via Twitter leads to higher reputation than crisis communication via blogs, which in turn leads to higher reputation than crisis communication via traditional newspapers.”

Demographic information indicates how twitter can be an effective resource for diplomats to measure the presence and level of communication, along with understating how economic and
social factors can influence users, the content being shared, and what the users are seeking on social media platforms. A further analysis, in fact, reveals that the number of Twitter users between 25 and 44 years of age has been growing significantly since late 2010. A 2011 report by the Pew Internet & American Life Project[2014] states that ‘although young adults continue to have relatively high rates of Twitter usage, the number of 30–49-year-olds who use the service has doubled since late 2010 – from 7% of such users in November to 14% in May 2014.’

5.3.3 Digital diplomacy platforms used by the Trump Administration

From the respondents it was evident that Twitter is the most dominant platform used as the respondents agreed to have come across at least a tweet of President Trump daily. Twitter and Facebook tied at the same percentage of 92% while blogs and Instagram were at 5% and 6% respectively. From the respondents it was evident President Trump is the first President to utilize Twitter actively irrespective of the existing public diplomacy strategies of the US, with direct effects on the White House and the US government defined public policies. In 2017, President Trump’s personal Twitter account—@realDonaldTrump—was considered as the key source of information preferred by the President for the generation of opinions and sentiments regarding the US civil societies and has also turned out as one of the White House’s tools for public diplomacy used in the generation of a larger proportion of media headlines (Al-Deen & Hendricks, 2012).

It is evident that major of Trump’s tweets has direct impact with international relation foreign policy, has it has often neem treated directly as it makes use of an increasingly straightforward language in which political and personal acknowledgments of the foreign state representatives
is common. Nevertheless, one may additionally see many sharp criticisms on the personal and informal language directed at the political leaders from different nations including Iran and North Korea (Gutsche, 2018). This, therefore, leads to the conflict between President Trump as a discontented citizen and President Trump as the US President, given that the specific activity accounts for almost 20 percent of the overall and has noteworthy global consequences. Russia tends to have a substantial weight in such matters, and this indicates President Trump’s disposition to the constructive relationship with the Russian regime.

5.3.3 Comparison of trump and Obama digital diplomacy and its impact on foreign policy

This study states that digital diplomacy is a necessary element of public diplomacy and that social media remains an integral part of digital diplomacy. With ‘virtual borderlessness’ official messages can be directed towards international audiences and towards different governments around the world. The acceleration of communication technology greatly contributed to the success of reaching out to foreign audiences during the Obama administration. This shows, that a wise and well-developed social media strategy can effectively mobilize public audiences and can engage effectively with foreign governments. The research also sought to compare influence former president Barack Obama and President Trump digital diplomacy on Us foreign policy. From the respondents it is evident that both presidents have divergent styles on foreign policy as locally, President Trump administration’s leadership style entails being anti-Obama, and a larger proportion of the population tend to like it. The research regarding ‘elite perceptions’ indicated that the President is amongst the most vital actors in influencing the foreign perceptions on the United States. (The other notable
political roles of the President do not have considerable resonance, even as the American government’s workings has been misunderstood overseas.

President Trump did not constitute the broad shift of the political parties; however, he is fundamentally the paradigm shift concerning the manner in which an individual makes use of the digital diplomacy as a key tool for foreign policy. In contradiction of the Obama administration, particularly with regards to the improvement of digital diplomacy, President Trump utilized twiplomacy in communicating individual feelings, intents and convictions that tend to go against the classical diplomatic communication’s norms. The complexity and style of communication may be inferred by the Flesch-Kincaid-based reading test, in which President Trump had the lowest score in relation to preceding presidents. Even though President Obama placed more emphasis on positive and deep substance as well as less on the style, this was reversed to short, simpler, and non-diplomatic style along with the dearth of intricate substance concerning the foreign policy.

The main lessons from United States experience include: Social media aptly adds on to the Digital Diplomacy efforts through expansion of the reach of extant activities using the direct and informal communication in addition to creating the potential for additional dialogue; Identification of the apt tools for reaching the target audiences is vital for effective social media outreach just as the recognition of its online nature extends its reach afar from intended audiences; the strategic approaches with regards to the social media outreach has to be shaped through the local contexts, and this includes the development of content aimed at encouraging interactions from the public and exploiting the trends within the environment of the target media; the various risks regarding the generation of harmful involvement from the social media outreach has to be recognized, but permitting for increased interactions enhances the audience
investment and may generate advantages over the rivals in relation to the target audiences; Efficiency of the social media efforts has to be founded on the engagement evidence with target audiences in addition to the development of the basis for longstanding engagement (Bjola & Holmes, 2015).

Social media’s utmost impact on the Digital Diplomacy happens through the creation of the potential for sustained dialogue and engagement. Through cautious management along with responsiveness to the interests of the users, a network primarily developed as a result of the single occasion has the probability of becoming a supportable community holding the shifting conversation. The strategies for social media usage as an integral part of the Digital Diplomacy efforts must focus on the creation of engagement aimed at encouraging interaction and fostering interest in longstanding dialogue.

The social media tools are prone to remain part of the United States’ Digital Diplomacy efforts; however, their effectual usage needs comprehension of their functions with regards to the information environment besides their aptitude to enable dialogue. The use of sustainable engagement in measuring the efficiency of the social media outreach is a key means of improving the policymakers and practitioners’ understanding of its various contributions to the Digital Diplomacy. Increased appreciation of the social media’s aptitude to generate engagement while also reinforcing the potential for prospective understanding is vital to the motivation of the federal lawmakers to offer Digital Diplomacy efforts and social media increased amount of fiscal support (Manor & Segev, 2017)
5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Effect of digital diplomacy by the Obama administration on effective US foreign policy

Obama managed to reinforce the usage of Social media as the central diplomacy component. From the ‘digital diplomacy’ as a novel public diplomacy to the cyberspace as a novel warfare frontier, ICT has become an inevitable tool for international relations. Debatably, social media has been involved in the transformative diplomacy moments (Bjola & Holmes, 2015). One has to ask how effectual the medium is with regards to the development of interpersonal trust amongst the individual diplomatic complements, in addition to if it may be a useful platform for discourse when conventional face-to-face diplomacy has been restricted or challenging difficult to attain. The popularity of Obama and the rapid expansion of social media globally have been noteworthy aspects, the United States has attained success given its understanding of Social Media’s potential as a key Digital Diplomacy tool and has utilized its various limitations in guiding the decision-making. Its aptitude to effectively manage the risks intrinsic in the use of social media devoid of considerable setbacks is an additional indication of the successes.

5.4.2 Effect of digital diplomacy by the Trump administration on effective US foreign policy

In summary, President Trump’s social media usage is frolicsome and has overturned the conventional judgment and wisdom as seen in his different presidential statements. Trump is seen to jumps from one crisis to another using the colloquial style in the delivery of messages
as opposed to the provision of concrete content. Trump has broken the rules, and this is considered to be apt for political communication communities.

President Trump makes use of the Twitter for personal activity. In reality, there are no major divergences in the messages of President Trump prior to and after being elected the US President. The president concentrates on the local issues in an increasingly partisan manner, and this reinforces his vote base. In tweeting the foreign policies, Trump lacks an institutional strategy for improving the American public diplomacy. Eventually, public diplomacy refers to the tool used in the achievement of foreign policy objectives as opposed to a mere instrument for advertising and self-promotion. Trump seems to be an observer within the global arena, as opposed to the lead actor. This clarifies his adverse feelings and eccentric ideas regarding Qatar, Russia, UK and Mexico attacks; ‘eccentric’ in such instances imply, not in line with customary US diplomacy. Herein, therefore, is the newness: whereas breaking off from the extant media intermediaries in addition to the public diplomacy deinstitutionalization, President Trump has sent direct messages that fail to promote diplomatic negotiations. The directly confrontational and one-way messages do not promote discourse, a major issue in the public diplomacy.

5.4.3 Norms and protocols of digital diplomacy that influence effective U.S. foreign policy

Based on findings from data evaluation and the results of the study, the research has revealed that digital diplomacy is an upcoming technique that is elevating digital diplomacy. We have witnessed the rise in digital diplomacy in alignment with political instability across the globe, leading to many stakeholders in the global policy environment to develop an instant connection
to the strength of social media. The revolution of social media in regard to communication facilitated by the internet is apparently not in the actual platforms, but in the expectations and standards, it has developed around the world. The rise of communication through social media is enabling diplomacy to become more prominent and accessible to the public; however, it does not change the idea, objectives, or behavior of diplomacy. Social media is a good platform for strengthening current relationships. It facilitates a way of regular communication during periods whereby parties would not regularly communicate.

The acts of the President do not increase value to the public diplomacy efforts of the U.S. on social media. Trump's attitude that is based on hyper-leadership is instigated by the rapidness of Twitter and reduces social capital while easing both trust and multicultural interaction. He blocks all other international policy parties by reducing the intelligence associated with the diplomatic community.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Credibility of the digital diplomacy content

The limitless opportunities of social media platform that enables any person to have an opinion on anything are bound to lead to sarcasm. It is argued that the values of traditional news are replaced with populist views in social media or those who are keener on self-publicity than public ethics value. The media house must develop a system of criteria which should be used to make decisions about the inclusion and exclusion of material. For credibility, it is essential to examine sources that facilitate information, analyze their digital content, view their location, and who they communicate with. Reliability, accuracy, validity, and authenticity of the user-generated content in the social networking sites are paramount to protect the integrity of the institution.
5.5.2 Ethical standards and policies on the use of the content

Information professionals in the Embassy studied must adhere to ethical standards and procedures. The validity, credibility, and accuracy of the social media content should be given greater emphasis in every ethical code in public communication. The Public Affairs Section must ensure that proper guidelines and policies on the usage of the social networking sites are provided to all the personnel engaged in social media to guarantee standards and professionalism.

5.5.3 Development of a social media communication strategy to avoid foreign policy crisis

Before using social media tools, it is crucial that public diplomacy expert comprehends the objective of the strategic policy and develop a communication objective. This will give the strategist insight into how these tools can be effectively used to get the desired results, or whether they are suitable tools for the ongoing campaign.

The Embassy management should be keen in developing a robust social media communication Strategy to streamline social media communication. The development of an engagement strategy will assist in determining the time social media workers will dedicate to social media interactions, the focus sectors for engagement, and the measurement of success. This will help in keeping communication simple and relaying the right information to the people who need at the time they need it. The strategy should provide a communication framework to ensure that the Embassy regularly engages and converse with its target audiences to increase citizen participation in pertinent issues.
Effective use of social media by the social media experts might not be to develop or initiate, but instead to moderate, facilitate, and direct. Whereas the Public Affairs sector may typically lack the ability to create viral content in a way that matches its guidelines, it can still apply its influence to help in the steering of conversations, and it can always assist in facilitating the forums or tools that enable communications to occur. The Embassy acknowledges that social media is a platform that is most effectively used by individuals and the general public since it enables them to converse through a popular tool at the same level thus the development of social media communication is paramount

5.6 Suggestions for further studies

The sectors of future research that were highlighted include similar research to be conducted in other areas of the impact of digital diplomacy on the ICT sector, for instance, digital advertising campaigns by the government to sensitize citizens, how digital diplomacy effects on growth of trade. Other areas of research should include the fight against cybercrime by law enforcement hinders E-diplomacy, a descriptive statistical data is critical to comprehend the nature of cybercrime and the threat it poses to digital diplomacy. Most importantly, more research should be conducted to examine novel methods and processes that will enhance the process of digital diplomacy, such as to avoid crises among countries.
REFERENCES


APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interviewees Full Name:
Gender:
Level of Education:
Department:
Phone Number:
E-mail:
Date of Interview:

Dear Interviewee, my name is Sandra Kisakye Nantongo. Currently I am a master’s student in Diplomacy and International Relations at United States International University- Africa. As part of the partial fulfilment of Master of Arts in Diplomacy and International Relations I am writing my thesis which focuses on: The use of digital diplomacy to effectively influence US foreign policy by President Obama and President Trump.

Your cooperation is truly appreciated, and I would like to request you to respond to the following questions which are relevant for the study. I would also like to remind you that your responses are to be used for the sole purpose of the research and remain confidential. Last but not least, the opinions you might express during the interview will by no means, intentionally or unwittingly, be taken as the formal stand of your organization and are personally attributed to you. Rest assured; you’re explicitly entitled to your own private views.

1. What do you understand by the term digital diplomacy? What are your thoughts on Digital Diplomacy in your work application?

2. As a practitioner of diplomacy, do you think Digital Diplomacy is a new tool for achieving traditional diplomatic goals or a new form of diplomacy?
3. How does going digital affect your work performance? It makes performance more efficient and effective?

4. What digital platforms do you consider at work? Embassy website, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat?

5. Do you think Social Media an effective tool for Official purpose? If so, how can diplomats and world leaders use it appropriately?

6. How does traditional diplomacy differ from digital diplomacy in term of international negotiations and relations? International negotiations and relations still mainly rely on “Traditional” face-to-face ways of meeting

7. Do you hold any expert opinion on the norms and protocols of digital diplomacy in relation to US foreign policy?

8. What are your thoughts on former President Obama administration’s use of social media to advance US foreign policy?

9. What are your thoughts on Trump’s administration’s current use of social media to advance US foreign policy?

10. In your opinion, how has President Trump’s frequent use of twitter changed diplomacy?

11. Can you make a brief comparison of both administrations use of social media in effectively influencing US foreign policy?
APPENDIX II: STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE U.S EMBASSY

SECTION A

Current designation---------------------------------------------

Occupation/profession-----------------------------------------

Department -----------------------------------------------

SECTION B

1. How long have you worked in the Embassy?

[ ] One year [ ] Two years [ ] Three years

[ ] Four years [ ] More than five years

2. What is the role of the official Embassy social media sites in your diplomacy work?

3. Which of the social networking sites below do you use?

[ ] Facebook [ ] Twitter

[ ] Youtube [ ] Flickr [ ] Others specify........................

4. What is the frequency of use of the social media?

[ ] Several times a day [ ] Once a day

[ ] Several times a week [ ] Once a week [ ] Several times a month

5. What is the impact of integrating social media in the mission’s public communication?

6. Does the embassy use social media sites to manage crisis?

7. If the answer to the above question is yes, what kinds of crisis have been solved by the embassy using social media?
8. How often do you measure the social media sites?

[ ] Daily [ ] Once a week [ ] Once a month

9. Which tools and methods do you use to measure and monitor social media applications in the Embassy?

10. Are the Embassy’s Facebook and Twitter accounts in particular, used for the same functions?

11. Who are the target groups in social media communications?

12. What are the purposes of using social media communications?

13. What are some of the benefits experienced by having the US Embassy social media accounts?

14. What are some of the challenges experienced by having the US Embassy social media accounts?

15. What measures, if any are employed to overcome the above challenges?

16. Do you have specific social media policies guiding the application of social media in public communication in the Embassy?

17. Please give any recommendations to enhance the use of social media communication in public diplomacy.

18. In your own opinion what is the future of social media in public communication?
APPENDIX III: STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

SECTION A

Current designation-----------------------------------------------

Occupation/profession-----------------------------------------

Department -----------------------------------------------

SECTION B

1. How long have you worked in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs?
   [ ] One year [ ] Two years [ ] Three years
   [ ] Four years [ ] More than five years

2. What is the role of the official Ministry of Foreign Affairs social media sites in your diplomacy work?

3. Which of the social networking sites below do you use?
   [ ] Facebook [ ] Twitter
   [ ] YouTube [ ] Flickr [ ] Others specify......................

4. What is the frequency of use of the social media?
   [ ] Several times a day [ ] Once a day
   [ ] Several times a week [ ] Once a week [ ] Several times a month

5. What is the impact of integrating social media in the mission’s public communication?

6. Are you aware if the Ministry of Foreign Affairs uses social media sites to manage crises?

7. If the answer to the above question is yes, what kinds of crisis have been solved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs using social media?

8. How often do you measure the social media sites?
[ ] Daily [ ] Once a week [ ] Once a month

9. Which tools and methods do you use to measure and monitor social media applications in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs?

10. Are the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’s Facebook and Twitter accounts in particular, used for the same functions?

11. Who are the target groups in social media communications?

12. What are the purposes of using social media communications?

13. What are some of the benefits experienced by having the Ministry of Foreign Affairs social media accounts?

14. What are some of the challenges experienced by having the Ministry of Foreign Affairs social media accounts?

15. What measures, if any are employed to overcome the above challenges?

16. Do you have specific social media policies guiding the application of social media in public communication at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs?

17. Please give any recommendations to enhance the use of social media communication in public diplomacy.

18. In your own opinion what is the future of social media in public diplomacy?