CHAPTER 3

DIGITAL DIPLOMACY: AN EVALUATION OF THE MEANS AND OPPORTUNITIES THAT DIGITALIZATION BRINGS TO DIPLOMACY

Oğuz GÖKSU[1], Abdullah ÖZKAN[2]

[1]Assoc. Prof. Dr., Gaziantep University, Faculty of Communication, Public Relations Department, Gaziantep, Turkey
e-mail: oguzgoxsu@gmail.com

[2]Prof. Dr., Istanbul University, Faculty of Communication, Public Relations Department, Istanbul, Turkey
e-mail: siyasaliletisim@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The process of globalization has led to important paradigm shifts in the understanding of classic diplomacy. In addition to the established diplomacy of the elite, these shifts have created a new sense of diplomacy based on the understanding of civil society, which inherently aim towards social persuasiveness and are of a civilian nature. With this new sense of diplomacy, the private sector, business people, academicians, think tanks, members of the media, etc., have also participated in this process, leading to a wave of diplomacy which has acquired a more civil and democratic character. Undoubtedly, these changes have also led to other important changes in the language, style, and management of diplomacy. Developments in information technologies and the construction of a digital world have wasted no time in becoming reflected in diplomacy; diplomatic missions have begun to change in terms of structure and operation, and steps have begun to be taken in accordance with the requirements of the digital world rather than through classical methods. These new forms of relationships and communication channels, which have resulted from developments in communication, informatics, and information technologies, have helped diplomatic processes move quickly towards the use of virtual media. What is now prominent are concepts such as network diplomacy, e-diplomacy and social media diplomacy, and this has resulted in the era of digital diplomacy. This article focuses on the parameters of the digital changes and evolution in the field diplomacy, as well as the effects of these changes on the state, society, and individuals. As a case study, the article focuses on the digitalization of diplomatic activities in Turkey and the role of digital media in the ability of Turkey to adequately express itself is discussed.

Keywords: Digital diplomacy, public diplomacy, information technologies, Turkey

1. Introduction

Diplomacy, which aims to protect the interests of nation-states, as well as to improve its standing against and relationships with other nation-states (İskit, 2007, p. 3) is a fundamental concept which is as old as the first government. The main players in the field of diplomacy are the nation-states themselves, and other international institutions also play an active role in the functioning of diplomacy. Concepts such as communication, negotiation, agreement, cooperation and conflict resolution are prominent notions in the world of diplomacy and many parameters, particularly technology, play a significant role in the evolution of the form that diplomacy takes.

Diplomatic relationships between nation-states in the previous century have evolved in the 21st century, and consequently the relationships between societies have been brought to the forefront. With the aim of constructing long-term relationships, which are defined in the literature as "public diplomacy", this evolution has emphasized the effective use of the soft power of countries in diplomacy. Public diplomacy is preferred as a result of the changing and evolving world order, and the communication and technological changes that they bring, and with the effective use of soft power, such as, culture, education, media and language, successful results can be achieved.

Public diplomacy is open to mutual communication and interaction. A one-way transfer of information to the public could be perceived as communication in the form of propaganda, which aims to direct the public and impose views upon them, and consequently it is highly likely that it would draw negative reactions within any society. However, an approach based on mutual understanding, expression, and communication means that the targeted audience can take part in the process which, in turn, leads to effective communication strategies (Özkan, 2016, p. 19).

The fact that public diplomacy is based on a communication-oriented strategy, that it sets long-term targets, and that it adopts a public-to-public flow of information indicate significant potential in terms of "relationship building". Mutual understanding, which is borne when relationships between societies, founded upon soft power elements such as culture, language, education, art, sports, science, etc. are preserved in the long term, bring about an environment of peace, preventing many problems and make it easier to resolve other problems (Özkan, 2014, p. 4).

Today, public diplomacy is used very effectively by countries in the international arena in order to construct permanently healthy relationships between countries, and to improve

economic, political, and cultural relationships. Public diplomacy has been affected by digitalization, which is still ongoing, and opportunities offered by the new media can be utilized at the highest level in the relationships between communities.

This article studies the dynamics of large-scale changes and evolution in diplomacy, investigates what type of opportunities are presented by the digital world in the field of diplomacy, and focuses on countries that utilize these resources in various ways, providing country-specific examples.

2. The General Situation in the Relationship between Diplomacy and Digitalization

Diplomacy is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as "the management of international relations by negotiations; the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys; the business or art of diplomats" (Demir, 2012, p. 7). Gökhan Yücel divides diplomacy into four categories. Diplomacy 1.0 involves real politics, national interests and propaganda which form the business of people in black suits, and the work by Henry Kissinger, "Diplomacy", symbolizes this category. Diplomacy 2.0 can be classified as public diplomacy which is centered around the relationship between states and nations, and is better understood by the "soft power" concept propounded by Joseph Nye. Digital diplomacy 3.0 is diplomacy which is practiced everywhere, at any time, for everyone. For this type of diplomacy, the state does not need to be on one end of communications at all times. Digital diplomacy is about limitlessness and it recognizes the limits of public diplomacy drawn by Westphalia. Diplomacy 4.0 is defined as "uber-diplomacy" which enables interaction between objects (Yenidiplomasi, 2015).

Digital diplomacy is a very new concept in Turkey. The concept first emerged in 2009 and has gradually begun to find its place in a range of diplomatic activities. As a strategic step, digital diplomacy is positioned as an element of soft power. When elements of public diplomacy manifest in the field of digital diplomacy, it results in an integration of public diplomacy, which is simply another interpretation of diplomacy, with digital elements. In a process where the online population is ever-increasing, digital diplomacy has become a very popular approach in international relations in order to spread the messages addressed to foreign nations.

According to annual survey results published by We are Social for 2018 on use of the Internet, social media, mobile phones, and e-commerce, in the current world population of 7.6 billion; 4 billion are Internet users, 3.2 billion active social media users and 5.2 billion

individual mobile phone users. In comparison to the previous year, the number of Internet users increased by 7% and active social media users increased by 13%. In terms of time spent on the Internet, Thailand, the Philippines, Brazil, and Indonesia all share first place with around 9 hours of daily use per person. In terms of social media penetration, the United Arab Emirates, South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Argentina are all placed near the top in the world. The Philippines, Brazil, and Indonesia are countries where people spend the most time on social media with about three and a half hours daily each, and the most sporadic users are in Japan with only 48 minutes per day. The most preferred social media platforms in the world are Facebook, YouTube and Whatsapp, respectively. The age ranges of Facebook and Instagram usage primarily falls into two groups, 18 to 24 and 25 to 34.

There is also important information available in the We are Social (2020) report, under the heading dedicated to Turkey. Turkey's population is approximately 83 million, of which 62 million are active Internet users, 54 million are active social media users, and 77 million individuals are mobile phone users. In Turkey in 2020, the number of Internet users increased by 10% and the number of active social media users increased by 4,2%, compared to the previous year's figures. On a typical day, Internet users in Turkey spend 7 hours on the Internet, and almost 3 hours on social media. Seventy percent of Internet users believe that new technologies bring unique advantages to people. The percentage of Internet users in Turkey compared to the entire population is 74%. Considering active social media use by gender, male users are seen to be more active than female users.

According to the 2020 report of We are Social, the number of Internet and social media users has been rapidly increasing in developing countries. One of the most striking points in the report is that underdeveloped and developing countries spend more time on the Internet than do developed countries.

The report also emphasizes that Ministries of Foreign Affairs make assumptions regarding the future, in terms of digitalization, based on data related to new media. While traditional diplomacy is still dominant in international relations, cyber-activism, which has developed with the growth of new media, is making its presence known within the scope of digital diplomacy (Lichtenstein, 2010; Yenidiplomasi, 2015).

3. On Digital Diplomacy

The concept of digital diplomacy may also be expressed by phrases, such as, "network/ social network diplomacy", "e-diplomacy", "online diplomacy", "cyber diplomacy", and

"Twitter diplomacy". Naci Koru, former deputy-secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, explains digital diplomacy in the following words: "Utmost utilization of technological infrastructure in the production and implementation of external policies" (Saka & Ezgin, 2016; Westcott, 2008; YouTube, 2011). Digital diplomacy allows classical diplomacy to be done through digital platforms. Digital diplomacy can be defined as the resolution of developments and problems relating to external policy using the Internet. Digital diplomacy is also defined as gaining a place in the hearts and minds of the foreign public through social networks, particularly through the use of Twitter and Facebook. Establishing communications with and transferring information to governments, NGOs, or foreign communities using digital tools are considered acts of digital diplomacy. The management of diplomacy through these means is an interactive process. It is considered a correct approach to support it with positive developments and maintain it in a planned manner. Digital diplomacy is addressed to targeted individuals, not targeted audiences. Digital diplomacy is a method which is used to prevent crises and avoid risks (Bahçeşehir, 2013; Sönmezışık, 2014).

Digital diplomacy is concerned with topics such as; soft power, power visualization, digital diaspora, digital cultural diplomacy, and digital country branding. Digital diplomacy also includes the concepts of futurism, online chatting, and cyber security. There are different opinions as to the definition and extent of digital diplomacy. In the USA, it is regarded as a new form of democratic diplomacy which requires technology-based Internet freedoms, is concerned with public expectations, and is closely related to cyber-activism. The UK considers digital diplomacy as the resolution of classical diplomacy problems using the Internet and the transfer of classical diplomacy over the Internet. On the other hand, well-meaning but irregular use of social media by political actors cannot in any way be considered as digital diplomacy (Bahcesehir, 2012; Hocking & Melissen, 2015).

Digital diplomacy is expressed in various ways in different countries: The United States Department of State explains digital diplomacy as "State governance in the 21st century", the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs describes it as "open policy", and the United Kingdom uses the terminology of "solving foreign policy problems using the Internet". According to Hocking and Milessen (2015), two approaches stand out in the world of digital diplomacy. These consist of "diplomatic processes" in the context of the function of diplomacy, and "diplomatic structures", such as foreign ministries, which focus on the institutions of diplomacy. The point to consider here is that the use of technology and online tools used in diplomatic relations are insufficient. The traditional codes of diplomacy are evolving as digital technologies are developed by changing and transforming diplomatic

relations. According to Hocking and Melissen, in order to make progress in diplomacy, actions must be taken by combining online and offline practices and strategies. Corneliu Bjola and Marcus Holmes (2015) focus on the collection, understanding, and analysis of discourses coming from the foreign public opinion in particular. Thus, predictive diplomatic reactions are made possible in the context of digital diplomacy (Clarke, 2015; Saka & Ezgin, 2016).

Digital diplomacy can bypass concepts of classical diplomacy such as; sovereignty, strategy, and geopolitics. Data, generated in the online world, by mobile devices and new technologies, brings with it a certain internal governance. Kosovo, which previously had a problem of recognition from a diplomatic point of view in the international arena, became an important agenda item on an international level when it was recognized as a country by Facebook. Countries such as the United States and Great Britain, which are considered to be pioneers in digital diplomacy, have well-designed digital diplomacy strategies. More than 1,000 personnel work in the digital diplomacy unit of the United States Department of State. In this area, Israel has also been taking important steps and investing in digital diplomacy in attempts to focus on digital innovation (Yücel, 2016).

Web 2.0 paved the way for individuals to become content producers, which removed the function of information dissemination from the hands of media monopolies, therefore enabling individuals to use this opportunity as well. Today, anyone who desires is able to become a content producer. Therefore, especially in crisis situations, states should act as the primary source of information and disseminators of information by acting very quickly on foreign policy issues without leaving it to other centers of power or individuals. When a state fails to inform the public regarding serious problems or fails to explain negative developments in detail, it inevitably leads to a crisis where disinformation can spread very quickly across social media. To avoid this situation, digital diplomacy is the most functional tool. Digital diplomacy can prevent a crisis by informing large masses of people very quickly, an ongoing crises can be stopped, and a situation or crisis can be brought under control without any confusion in the information being disseminated. Digital diplomacy is a tool for building persuasion and perception within the big picture, but the critical point is how countries design their digital diplomacy and create content. Digital diplomacy determines which messages countries will provide to foreign countries and other interested stakeholders, as well as how to present these messages in conceptual terms.

While it is possible to reach a very wide audience with social media, the biggest handicap of digital diplomacy is the possibility of a negative correlation between the effectiveness of the messages. Therefore, careful planning is required. A critical error can result in mistakes

that may prove very difficult to correct (Digitalaffairs, 2010; Mytko, 2012). The example of Wikileaks has shown that nation-states should abandon the culture of secrecy, albeit in part. In this context, more transparent management approaches should be developed through foreign ministries and digital diplomacy should be defined as the main tool in rapid and accurate dissemination of public information concerning important diplomatic developments.

Digital diplomacy is centered around viral interaction. The content of digital diplomacy is composed of ministries, ministries' digital activities, and the digital assets with which these activities are regularly maintained. Digital diplomacy may be differentiated from traditional diplomacy through digital learning, interaction, and communication processes. With digitalization, long and difficult diplomatic processes between states are gradually disappearing, and subsequently diplomatic relations between states and citizens, and between citizens themselves, are beginning to become more effective. For example, Twitter messages can sometimes raise effective solutions to a number of issues that international relations have difficulty solving. Social media and digital tools can enable the discussion and finalization of diplomatic issues, which may take months to solve, in front of a wide audience in a transparent way (Yücel, 2016).

According to Corneliu Bjola and Lu Jiang (2015), the use of social media by diplomats can have a transformative effect. Diplomats' social media activity show the effectiveness of digital diplomacy in the creative design of agenda setting, information, and communication. The rapid development of new media and digital communication tools has brought about a significant evolution in diplomacy and corporate operations of diplomatic relations (Saka & Ezgin, 2016). Traditional methods applied in the past, in inter-state relations, have been partially abandoned, and shares on social media have been presented to the world as public opinion on important issues at the level of ministries as well as at the level of heads of state.

Digital diplomacy provides fast and practical opportunities for explaining and communicating cultural qualities to foreign societies. In the context of European countries, digital diplomacy in the information age in which we live, has been shown to be the most functional cultural ambassador to reach all relevant stakeholders; from ordinary citizens to artists, and from various organizations to corporate organizations. In order to create creative content in digital diplomacy, more intensive integration with technological developments is required. The United Kingdom uses digital diplomacy as a tool for international communication. In this context, the government is trying to use digital platforms, such as the British Council and Digital Theatre, in order to spread its cultural assets more effectively (Grincheva, 2012). Digital diplomacy provides countries with visibility and recognition

through digital channels, as well as allowing target audiences to quickly reach a country's diplomatic activities online and learn about new developments.

Digital diplomacy activities should be studied within the following three categories: The first category is real-time surveillance, the second is the identification and training of strong online actors, and the last category is through direct dialogue and interaction with the wider masses. Aino Huxley (2014), in her study on the digital diplomacy activities of Finland, found that 11 ministries produced content in their respective areas, as well as publicizing in detail their country's cultural and political characteristics. In digital diplomacy, Twitter is the most dominant digital platform among the social networks. Foreign ministries follow each other and correspond on Twitter as well as participate in and launch hashtag campaigns through the platform (Saka & Ezgin, 2016).

Understanding, planning, participation, and active support are all integral parts of both public diplomacy and digital diplomacy. Based on this, the aim is to make use of digital communication and digital diplomacy within the context of public diplomacy by paying more attention to strategic communications. Ensuring public participation in such processes is considered a duty for diplomats (Gregory, 2011; Saka & Ezgin, 2016). Technology is the most important element of soft power in today's world. There have been many opportunities to use technology as an element of soft power (Varoğlu, 2013, p. 7). In one way, digital diplomacy is a diplomatic technique used in the construction of soft power (Yücel, 2016). On this axis and as output from the technological evolution, digital diplomacy is used in the context of public diplomacy and international relations.

4. Digital Diplomacy - Activities and Examples

The United States, Israel, and the United Kingdom are leading countries where the importance of digital diplomacy has been recognized and used effectively. The United States Department of State has created a "state plan" for digital diplomacy under the heading "21st Century Statecraft". In Israel, due to the shortcomings and irregularities of public diplomacy, activities known as "Hasbara", a project of "training citizen diplomats" has been launched. These citizens will be given the opportunity to represent their countries in the new media in the future. The United Kingdom, through the work of its Foreign and Commonwealth Office, has prepared and published a manual for social media tools. In 2013, Sweden attracted attention with the practice of its "digital diplomacy team" which gained many followers on social networks. Many countries have begun to appoint people who have been trained in digital diplomacy to work with their ambassadors (Clarke, 2015; Radikal, 2012; Webrazzi,

2014). In the context of "21st Century Statecraft", which was established by the United States Department of State, the new media offers opportunities for diplomats to express themselves while listening to its citizens as well as people from other parts of the world. In line with this model, ambassadors and diplomats are given digital diplomacy training and are encouraged to integrate using both local and global social media tools for the purpose of dialogue. The Department of State and other units of the department have been communicating with people in various parts of the world in 11 different languages through 301 Twitter accounts. Active use of numerous social media platforms has enabled contact with 20 million people worldwide (State, 2010).

For the first time in 2002, the United States Department of State officially commenced its digital diplomacy activities. The United Kingdom and Sweden are among the pioneering countries in this field (Saka & Ezgin, 2016). In 2012, many countries, ministries, and political actors started actively using social media implying recognition of the power of social media. In 2015, at the commencement of the G20 summit held in Turkey, President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's Twitter account saluted the participating heads of state in nine languages, thereby sending a message to the global public. Such examples have increased in recent years and patterns in classical diplomacy have begun to be abandoned.

The study titled "The State of Digital Diplomacy 2016" focuses on implementations in digital diplomacy by heads of state and their offices. According to this report, in 2016 the President of the Philippines, Rodrigo Duterte, was the best Snapchat user, the President of Paraguay, Enrique Pena Nieto, was the best Periscope user, the best social media user was the President of Argentina Mauricio Macri, and the best social media, Instagram, and Google Plus user was the White House. Barack Obama was the best United States president in using Youtube channels and LinkedIn pages. The best Vine user was the French government (Elysee France) and the best user of Google Plus was Ali Khamenei, the Supreme Leader of the Iran Islamic Republic (Sodd16, 2016). On the other hand, traditional media can also integrate and contribute to digital diplomacy. TRT AVAZ's broadcasting in digital media in five languages is an indication of how media can be effective in digital diplomacy (Yücel, 2016).

The United Kingdom is one of the pioneers in digital diplomacy. The first country to develop a "Digital Public Diplomacy" strategy was the United Kingdom. As a unit of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the Digital Diplomacy department has an extensive agenda of activities. A guide for using social media and other new technologies was prepared by the Digital Diplomacy Department to train diplomats in these areas before they start working abroad. If the messages given by the diplomats reach the right target audience, their

effect becomes multiplied and, consequently, reaches a wider mass. One of the important advantages of this is that there is no cost to this process. For such reasons, digital public diplomacy displays significant advantages over traditional diplomacy (Mytko, 2012).

One important example of the use of digital diplomacy as a strategy is Kosovo. Kosovo declared its independence on February 17, 2008. The efforts of Kosovo to become recognized as a state at a global level were supported by digital diplomacy. The state defined all its citizens as "digital diplomats" and with the support of its citizens, it attempted to gain visibility and support using digital platforms. Meanwhile, the Wiki Academy, established within the context of the digital diplomacy strategy of the Republic of Kosovo's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, took steps towards correcting negative or missing information on Wikipedia. Hence, efforts were made to correctly and conveniently represent Kosovo in the world. The #InstaKosovo hashtag was also used to introduce the country to the world. Moreover, impressive footage from Kosovo was shared on digital media in attempts to create an image for Kosovo (Korhan, 2018).

In the digital era, web sites, social media accounts, news portals, and online forums play very important roles in defining a country's image, even more so on a global level (Korhan, 2018, p. 278). Digital diplomacy allows many players to be involved in the diplomatic process. This means that diplomacy is no longer under the monopoly of a state but rather that different institutions, organizations, and individuals can also become involved.

One of the countries active in the field of digital diplomacy is Israel. Due to a need to restore its image globally, partly due to the "Mavi Marmara" event, Israel decided to manage its diplomatic relations through the new media. A post-graduate program was opened at Haifa University in 2012 in order to train "citizen diplomats". Its students, the future "online Ambassadors", received education relating to online activities such as information entry and updating of Wikipedia pages, the use of forums, blogs, chat rooms, Facebook and Twitter, and how to behave in comment sections of online newspapers. These students then acted as "citizen diplomats" on behalf of Israel in the context of digital diplomacy in the new media. In 2009, Israel opened its Twitter consulate to impress the global community. The Israeli diaspora has been running organized public diplomacy activities and supports these activities through digital diplomacy (Radikal, 2012; Digitalaffairs, 2010; Westcott, 2008).

The Asper Institute for New Media Diplomacy bears the responsibility for communication of Israel's message to the global community and focuses on the roles, functions and utilization of new media technologies. This institute works on the image of Israel from different perspectives (Demir, 2012, p. 157). The state of Israel, as a policy, uses digital diplomacy

as a tool while attaching importance to the new media. In efforts to create a digital image through the new media, digital diplomacy activities are not left as the sole responsibility of foreign ministries and diplomats. In the context of public diplomacy, diplomatic activities are presented to the world within the framework of digital diplomacy by way of non-governmental activities.

A different example in terms of the use of digital diplomacy can be seen in the case of Egypt. During the Arab Spring, the government disabled access to the Internet for five days, hence significantly restricting the organization and actions of activists. The United States became involved with arguments regarding "Internet freedom" and "democratic development" and trained activists on how to communicate using proxy servers, online gambling sites, and marriage sites (Yılmaz, 2012, p. 162).

According to the 2013 Digital Diplomacy report, Iran was among the most notable countries in the Eastern bloc in this field, similar to the examples of the the United States and United Kingdom. The Iranian President, Hassan Rouhani, spoke to President Barack Obama on Twitter, sent a message to the Pope, celebrated a Jewish holiday, and established dialogue with Twitter founder, Jack Dorsey, and journalist, Christian Amanpour. Due to these interactions, it can be said that the embargo imposed on Iran was broken through the use of digital media.

The game "Trace Effects", developed by the United States Department of State, was one of the distinguishing examples in the field of digital diplomacy (Americanenglish, 2018). Digital diplomacy has gone beyond the dimension of international relations and reached the stage of transferring and teaching cultural values. The Department of State's "Trace Effects" game, followed by other practices, has enabled nations to convey their cultural qualities to other countries and communities through digital diplomacy. The Department of State developed this video game to teach American English and culture to children and young people. The target audience was children and young people aged 12 to 16 years. Within the scope of this game, the values of American society are presented to users, as well as the themes of entrepreneurship, activism, environmental protection, conflict resolution, women's rights and empowerment, science, and innovation. In the game, Trace is a university student from the year 2045. In order to make the future a better place, Trace is expected to help six young people to do well to return home. The Department of State identified children and young people as target audiences with this seven-stage game and included younger generations in digital diplomacy. Therefore, young people and children around the world, who want to learn English, can do so and learn about American English and culture at the same time. This game

has turned cultural diplomacy into a game as well. The U.S. Department of State hosts this game together with education and cultural officers as well as with various public diplomacy and foreign affairs' units.

On January 4, 2012, Barack Obama became the first among world leaders to open an Instagram account (Twiplomacy, 2018). In June 2010, Obama sent his first tweet which made him the first president to use Twitter (Yılmaz, 2012, p. 147). Obama's "four more years" tweet, which he wrote under a photo in which he was hugging his wife after winning the United States presidential election in 2012, became the most retweeted message of all time with 749,301 retweets (Telegraph, 2012).

The use of social media by political actors plays an important role in the functioning of digital diplomacy. Particularly, the use of Twitter by politicians, the number of their followers, and their interactions are designed as a means of digital diplomacy. The importance of digital diplomacy has been increasing in parallel with the growth of digitalization and in the way that political messages are shared on social media, thereby reaching large numbers of people. They become elements of the media agenda, as well as communicating official views to other countries at the level of presidents or ministers of foreign affairs.

According to Twiplomacy's ranking on January 1, 2019, the political actors with the highest number of followers on Twitter are as follows (Twiplomacy, 2019):

No.	Political Leaders/Presidents	Number of Twitter Followers	Number of Instagram Followers
**Table 1.** Overview of the social media accounts of important political leaders
1	Donald Trump / @realDonaldTrump (President of the United States)	56 Million	11 Million
2	Pope Francis / @Pontifex (President of the Pontifical Commission for Vatican City State)	47 Million	5 Million
3	Narendra Modi / @narendramodi (Prime Minister of India)	44 Million	16 Million
4	Narendra Modi / @PMOIndia (Prime Minister of India)	27 Million	-
5	Donald Trump / @POTUS (President of the United States)	24 Million	--
6	ABD Presidency / @WhiteHouse (USA)	17 Million	4 Million
7	Recep Tayyip Erdoğan / @RT_Erdogan (President of Turkish Republic)	13 Million	4 Million
8	Sushma Swaraj / @SushmaSwaraj (Minister of External Affairs of India)	12 Million	--
9	Joko Widodo / @Jokowi (President of Indonesia)	10 Million	14 Million
10	Queen Rania / @QueenRania (Queen of Jordan)	10 Million	5 Million

According to the ranking of Twiplomacy, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, as a political leader in Turkey, was ranked in fourth position amongst leaders with followers on Twitter with 5,706,601 followers in 2014. In the same year, the political leader with the highest number of followers in the world was President Barack Obama with 49,166,434 followers (Twiplomacy, 2014). Erdoğan has been one of the top leaders in the world in terms of Twitter usage since 2013. Erdoğan has more followers than many world leaders, such as, Vladimir Putin, Dmitry Medvedev, François Hollande, Theresa May, Angela Merkel, Emmanuel Macron, and David Cameron. In addition, @tcbestepe, which is the official Twitter account for the Presidency of the Republic of Turkey was ranked 14th amongst those with the highest number of followers with over 6 million in 2018. These numbers can be interpreted as an indication that a message will reach a wider audience through Erdoğan's use of digital diplomacy.

In 2018, Erdoğan ranked 8th among 50 leaders with the most interactions on Instagram, and 7th among the most acclaimed leaders and 2nd among the most influential leaders. Erdoğan also ranked 7th among 50 leaders with the highest amount of interaction and number of followers, and 6th among the most influential 50 leaders. On Facebook, Erdoğan was 6th among the most followed 50 leaders in 2018, 10th with the most interactions, and 7th among the most influential (Twiplomacy, 2018). The popularity of Erdoğan on social networks is an indication that Turkey has strong players in the field of digital diplomacy.

5. Turkey's Digital Diplomatic Presence and Applications

Turkey has realized some important initiatives in digital diplomacy. Most of these studies were carried out under the leadership of the foreign ministry. Public diplomacy, which can be described as a "countries' communication of activities and policies in their work within different disciplines to the international community and various public forums", is able to fulfill this mission through the new media. Digital diplomacy should not be limited to the use of social media by important players. The process of making maximum use of all opportunities offered by digitalization promotes the functions of digital diplomacy.

In December 2009, Deputy Undersecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Namık Tan, stated that in terms of public diplomacy, embassies will become more visible in social networks, such as, Twitter and Facebook (Digitalaffairs, 2010). Yenidiplomasi.com founder, Halil İbrahim İzgi, emphasizes that Turkey does not yet have a digital diplomacy strategy and that this is a huge handicap. On the other hand, according to İzgi, there are well-intentioned steps being taken in Turkey, but they will only have real meaning when they are conducted in an orderly manner. According to Yücel, digital diplomacy is user-centric and new media users in Turkey have been

taking a very active approach. Turkey's human capital stands out as the most important element as it requires the inclusion of users in digital diplomacy (Radikal, 2012).

One of the first examples of digital diplomacy in Turkey occurred when four American journalists were detained in Libya in 2011 and were subsequently rescued as a result of Turkey's efforts. Namık Tan, Turkey's Washington Ambassador, announced the rescue of the journalists on Twitter and then shared photographs of the journalists. This is an example that demonstrates the presence of Turkish diplomacy in the new media. When Turkish citizens were evacuated from Libya in 2011, communication was established with them via the Internet since phone lines were not available at the time. During the evacuation of these people, the Internet was also used. It would not be wrong to name Ali Rıza Çolak, Ambassador of the Republic of Turkey in Belgrade, as an active digital diplomacy user. Another example is Ahmet Davutoğlu's announcement on his Twitter account, as Minister of Foreign Affairs on an official visit to Batumi, that the President of Egypt, Hosni Mubarak, had been overthrown (Radikal, 2012). Such events indicate that the new media can be more visible than conventional media under certain conditions.

"The State of Digital Diplomacy 2016" report highlights the areas where Turkey stands out. Among presidents, the most successful Facebook page belongs to Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, President of the Turkish Republic. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan was also one of the first Facetime users. The fact that Erdoğan communicated with the public using Facetime during the coup attempt on 15 July 2016 proved to be a major event not only within the local but also within the global community. According to total metric interaction data, Erdoğan was the sixth best president in terms of his use of Facebook between 1 January 2016 and 31 December 2016. Erdoğan also became the fifth most popular president on Facebook. When presidential leaders' Twitter accounts were examined, Erdoğan's had the fifth most active Twitter account. On Instagram, Erdoğan's had the eighth most active presidential account. The Turkish Presidency's Twitter account is also very active, compared to presidential accounts of other countries. The Presidential Twitter account, among all presidential accounts, received the most likes, retweets, and shares with 7,666,259 single interactions. The President's English language Twitter account became the eighth account with the most interactions (Sodd16, 2016).

The report named the "15.07.gov.tr" website as the best awareness-raising portal. Prepared for the martyrs of 15 July, this website is characterized by its very detailed narration of the coup attempt and follow ups of news and information relating to it. Meanwhile, AFAD's (Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency) website was named the best portal in terms of disaster and crisis management.

For both political actors and government agencies, digital platforms are a means to rapidly share information, photographs, and videos to a wide range of audiences. Digital diplomacy is increasing in value and functionality everyday, especially in terms of informing, keeping the global community up-to-date, and sharing opinions on current issues. Digital diplomacy provides political actors with the opportunity to directly reach and interact with their audiences by bypassing traditional media. On the other hand, with digital diplomacy, users can become primary sources of information.

Research titled "Digital Government 2016", prepared by the Diplomacy.live platform, was extended to cabinet members and ministries working in the Government of the 64th Turkish Republic. The study measures and grades the content management skills of 49 users in terms of social media presence, influence, access, mobile application use, concurrency, etc., based on 97 factors within the scope of 12 social media networks, including Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, Flickr, Google Plus, Pinterest, YouTube, Periscope, Slideshare, Tumblr, Vine, and LinkedIn. Based on this analysis, the study yielded important results in terms of digital diplomacy. According to the Digital Government 2016 Digital Presence Ratings, the ministry, which made the most effective use of digital platforms, was the Ministry of Youth and Sports. Fikri Işık, the Minister of Science, Technology and Industry, was named the most active minister in terms of digital media. The most active ministry on YouTube was the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and, on Instagram, the Ministry of Youth and Sports. Süleyman Soylu, Minister of the Interior, was the dominant player in terms of Twitter use, Faruk Çelik, Minister of Food, Agriculture and Forestry in terms of Youtube use, Fikri Işık in terms of Instagram usage and Ahmed Davutoğlu, the then Prime Minister, in terms of Facebook use (Thebrandage, 2016).

As can be seen, digitalization dominates the daily activities of various members of the government. Communication with both internal and external target audiences is established almost exclusively through digital channels. When governments publish their work in a digital environment, there tends to be a positive impact on the country's external presentation and the brand development of the country.

A study of follower profiles of institutions, such as, the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TİKA), the Turkish Red Crescent and the Presidency for Turks Abroad and Related Communities, which represent Turkey abroad, reveals that they have as many foreign followers as local followers (Koyuncu & Medin, 2017, p. 1241). This emphasizes the importance of digital diplomacy, while at the same time rendering Turkey's humane diplomatic activities more visible.

Turkey's Digital Diplomacy Players	Twitter (Followers)	Instagram (Followers)	Facebook (Likes)	YouTube (Subscribers)
Recep Tayyip Erdoğan	RT_Erogan 13,586,295	5,231,297	9,029,845	--
Presidency of the Republic of Turkey	6,512,637	661,431	1,790,523	37,866
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	1,332,726	--	295,254	5,672
Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu (Minister of Foreign Affairs)	1,290,291	104,031	287,068	--
Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Directorate of Communications	457,226	19,247	635,652	66
İbrahim Kalın (Presidential Spokesperson)	1,402,617	--	--	--
Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TİKA)	197,146	41,188	46,575	3,077
The Turkish Red Crescent	804,601	101,549	284,407	8,258
The Presidency for Turks Abroad and Related Communities (YTB)	61,067	39,523	193,455	7,891
Yunus Emre Institute (YEE)	31,335	10,079	48,759	4,054

Table 2. Social media accounts of Turkey's prominent digital diplomacy players (Updated on 3 April 2019)

This view of social media accounts is an indicator of the potential for Turkey's digital diplomacy players, institutions, and society. It is considered essential to move this potential to higher levels with investments in digital innovation.

6. Digital Diplomacy Efforts by the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs

The Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs operates in various fields for the purposes of utilizing digital tools and creating effective visibility in the new media. In addition to the corporate website, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs provides visibility through digital platforms in its social media accounts. The Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs prefers to address foreign communities in their own language. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs' official website offers English, French, and Arabic languages as well as Turkish. With the aid of different language options, foreigners can more effectively use the website for their activities and for their information collection.

A comparison of the social media accounts of the United States Department of State and the Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs highlights a striking difference. The most active ministry in the United States in terms of digital diplomacy is the Department of State.

The Department of State has accounts on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, Google+, YouTube, Flickr, and Tumblr. The Department also has a blog known as "Dipnote". The Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs has accounts on Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is not the only public institution that has assumed roles in terms of digital diplomacy. The "Directorate of Communications", which was established after the transition to the presidential system of government, has begun coordinating communication activities for the Republic of Turkey. The Directorate of Communications also has also taken over the activities of the Public Diplomacy Coordination Office (KDK) which was established in 2010. In addition to its official website, the Directorate of Communications has Twitter accounts administered in English and Russian. These accounts address foreign communities in their own languages, directly interacting with citizens from other countries regarding current events in dialogues that extend beyond classic diplomatic rhetoric.

One recent example of digital diplomacy was observed following the local elections on 31 March 2019. The President of the Republic of Turkey's Director of Communications, Fahrettin Altun, responded to remarks from the United States State Department's spokesperson on Twitter regarding the election results for the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality in English. Such examples have occurred many times in recent history. This dimension of diplomatic relations suggests that a transparent communication strategy should be adopted for the wider community.

In this context of digital diplomacy, an e-consulate (virtual consulate) and e-passport applications have been developed. Since 2007, the Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs has used the e-consulate application. The e-consulate makes it possible for 80-90% of procedures, which would previously have been carried out in traditional ways at physical consulates, to now be carried out by electronic means. The e-passport application is a project conducted together with the Ministry of the Interior. As of 1 June 2010, the Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs began to issue e-passports. E-passports provide a high level of security. The chips in the passports contain all identification data and photographs. In terms of relations with the European Union (EU), and in line with international civil aviation criteria, an e-passport is currently one of the most important topics in terms of international relations.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs' e-visa application is another process enabled by digital diplomacy. The "evisa.gov.tr" website, which was created for the purpose of this application, demonstrates Turkey's knowledge in the field of digital diplomacy. The website was accepted

as the best portal in "The State of Digital Diplomacy 2016" report. In an evaluation of the digital performance of 210 countries, the Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs was ranked 25th among 210 countries in the study which measured the digital diplomacy assets of foreign ministries across 25 social media platforms, including assessments of their activities on websites and mobile applications. As a digital environment which enables many applications relating to various diplomatic representative institutions within Turkey as well as to foreign diplomats, the Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs' "Diplomatic Portal" application was also included in the report and cited as a successful venture.

Another important application developed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Spouses' Solidarity Association. This association was established to assist families of foreign affairs and other ministry officials who had been martyred during a mission abroad. The association also offers activities aimed at introducing Turkey and Turkish culture to foreigners, including the spouses of foreign mission chiefs in Ankara. This website was named as "the best diplomatic club site" in "The State of Digital Diplomacy 2016" report. In short, the Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs has worked proactively in the field of digital diplomacy and performed its activities with a high level of sensitivity in regard to the effective and correct use of the means of communication in the digital world.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

This study, which examined the parameters of digital change and transformation in diplomacy, and investigated the impacts of those changes on the state, society, and individuals, shows that the transfer of classical diplomacy to the Internet has resulted in an alternative approach to diplomacy. Having regard to digital diplomacy as a strategy within the broader framework of diplomacy, it systematically enables countries to be represented effectively in digital environments. Countries support their national foreign policies with digital diplomacy. In this context, digital diplomacy is utilized as a complementary tool. National foreign policy strategies and messages exist in the new media by way of digital diplomacy, and are able to be made visible through online media websites as well as social media accounts.

Digital diplomacy is perceived as change management in global politics. Institutions and practitioners try to manage the digital process by coming together in the common denominator. Through social media platforms, countries introduce their own endeavors to different audiences on the public diplomacy axis and are able to use digital tools for this purpose (Holmes, 2015). In order to stand out in digital diplomacy, nation-states need to make

huge investments in the field. Many things in the world are now controlled by algorithms where ordinary citizens are only aware of the interfaces. In this sense, algorithmic superiority now plays an integral role in the protection of a country's diplomatic interests (Yücel, 2016).

Turkey currently does not act in the field of digital diplomacy with the same level of sensitivity that it applies to cyber security (Sönmezışık, 2014). However, the evolutionary effect of digitalization, artificial intelligence, technological developments, and social media platforms in every walk of life requires Turkey to adopt a more active position. Digital diplomacy also introduces the concept of the digital image and digital branding of a country. In the future, other developed countries will begin to invest in their digital images just as the United States, Israel and the United Kingdom have done.

Regarded as the modern continuation of traditional diplomacy and public diplomacy, digital diplomacy has gained a very important role thanks to the rapid rise and widespread nature of the convenience of digital and social media, digital branding, digital citizenship, digital diaspora, digital journalism, and social movements. In this sense, digital diplomacy presents an interdisciplinary perspective. Digital diplomacy is far from being a kind of diplomatic problem; but rather it is a matter of digital transformation and digital innovation (Yücel, 2016). While diplomacy still has a heavy presence among the governments of nation-states, digital diplomacy appears to be an integral part of this process due to the power, influence, and all-encompassing environments created by digitalization (Westcott, 2008).

Turkey has taken a number of steps forward in terms of digital diplomacy, but its shortcomings in digital investment are far more apparent. The issues that need to be addressed by Turkey in terms of digital diplomacy can be summarized as follows:

- Digital diplomats should be trained, digital transformation training should be given, related programs should be opened in universities, and pioneering countries and best practices in this field should be closely monitored and current developments should be pursued. Digital diplomacy will be the most important tool in addressing online audiences and "online colleagues".

- A digital diplomacy strategy should be developed in the field, following which systematic and pre-planned steps should be taken. State officials, particularly the officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, should be trained in the field. After educating professionals in professional training programs in the area of digital diplomacy, dynamic digital diplomacy activities should be carried out through these professionals.

- Turkey should produce content for digital diplomacy in an attempt to manage foreign impressions regarding Turkey. In line with this aim, as an exercise beyond the transfer of news and developments from the traditional media to the new media, the dialogue-based structure of digital media should be utilized and foreign communities should be addressed directly.

- Twitter should be used for dialogue purposes from time to time, and should be positioned as an information tool. All information disseminated by traditional methods should be conveyed to the new media in an innovative way.

- Within the framework of digital diplomacy, an Internet series should be started immediately. The increased interest in Turkish TV series should be utilized on digital platforms. A "project series" aimed particularly at Middle Eastern and Arabic communities, starring the most popular actresses and actors in those communities, could be broadcast. An exclusive series which can be broadcast in Turkey and simultaneously to the Arabic world by means of the Internet should be prepared in a suitable format. In cooperation with the Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, an interactive project series should be prepared in an attempt to make Turkish culture and Turkish language more widespread.

- As a precaution against rising Islamophobia in the West, Turkey should utilize the tools provided by digital diplomacy. In order to overcome the dominance of the orientalist perspective, Turkey should prioritize its cultural values, as well as its secular and democratic management structure.

- Digital diplomacy should be evaluated in the context of country branding as well as in the field of international relations. The potential brought about by digital diplomacy should be utilized to reinforce a country's image, and a long-term strategic roadmap should be prepared for Turkey with contributions from all shareholders within society.

Whether diplomatic attempts are made using traditional tools and methods or by way of digital environments brought to us by the 21st Century, the most critical aspects to take into account are to act strictly in line with the foundational principles of legitimacy in state policies, and to act in accordance with the requirements of the law, the state, and democracy. Only in this way can diplomacy serve to achieve international peace and to bring countries together. Spreading an understanding of diplomacy, which overlooks legitimacy, breaches international law and restricts freedom, and in the digital world will only serve to worsen current problems and introduce further contradictions. However, our world and the international community

have wearied of recent conflicts, and have a desire for calmness, brotherhood, and peace. It must be the common hope of everyone who believes in peace that digitalization disseminates the good, the beautiful, and the right through the pathways of democracy and law.

References

21st century statecraft. (2010, May 27). Retrieved from http://www.state.gov/statecraft/overview/index.htm

Clarke, A. (2015). Business as usual? An evaluation of British and Canadian digital diplomacy as police change. In C. Bjola, & M. Holmes (Eds.), *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (pp. 111–126). New York, NY: Routledge.

Çağıl, M, K. (2012, August 24). Türkiye dijital diplomaside emekliyor [Turkey creeps digital diplomacy] [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.radikal.com.tr/dunya/turkiye_dijital_diplomaside_emekliyor-1081387

Çelebi, B. (2018, June 6). Dijital diplomasi [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.usmed.org.tr/blog/dijital-diplomasi/

Çömlekçi, M. F. (2019). Dijitalleşen diplomasi ve sosyal medya kullanımı: Büyükelçilik Facebook hesapları üzerine bir araştırma [The Digitalisation of Diplomacy and Social Media Usage: A Research on Embassy Facebook Accounts]. *Kırklareli Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* [Kırklareli University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences]*, 8*(1), 1–13.

Demir, V. (2012). Kamu diplomasisi ve yumuşak güç [Public diplomacy and soft power]. *Istanbul, Turkey: Beta Yayınları.*

Digital in 2018. (2018, December 20). *Digital in 2018* [Web log post] Retrieved from https://wearesocial.com/blog/2018/01/global-digital-report-2018

Digital in 2020. (2020, May 12). *Digital in 2020* [Web log post] Retrieved from https://wearesocial.com/digital-2020

The State of Digital Diplomacy 2016 Report (2016, April 24). *Dijital Araştırmalar Derneği'nin Dijital Hükümet 2016 reyting sonuçları* [The Results of The Research Association about The State of Digital Diplomacy 2016 Report] [Web log post] Retrieved from https://www.thebrandage.com/dijital-arastirmalar-derneginin-dijital-hukumet-2016-reyting-sonuclari-aciklandi

Digital Diplomacy (2010, January 23). *Digital Diplomacy* [Web log post] Retrieved from http://www.digitalaffairs.org/?p=7

Digital Diplomacy Discussed at DiplomatSchool (2012, December 3). [Web page post] Retrieved from http://www.bahcesehir.edu.tr/icerik/1778-diplomat-okulunda-digital-diplomasi-konusuldu

Followed world leaders in 2018. (2019, March 4). [Web page post] Retrieved from https://twiplomacy.com/ranking/the-50-most-followed-world-leaders-in-2018/

Gregory, B. (2011). American public diplomacy: Enduring characteristics, elusive transformation. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 6*(3-4), 351–372.

Grincheva, N. (2012). Digital diplomacy rhetoric: International policy frame transformations in diplomatic discourse. *Encatc Journal of Culturel Management and Policy, 2*(2), 12–29.

Hocking, B., & Melissen, J. (2015). *Diplomacy in the digital age*. Clingendael Report. The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael.

Holmes, M. (2015). Conclusion. The future of digital diplomacy. In C. Bjola, & M. Holmes (Eds.), *Digital diplomacy: Theory and practice* (pp. 199–206). New York, NY: Routledge.

Public Diplomacy in the Internet Age. (2015, March 3). Speech of Gökhan Yücel [Video]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W7cR638nvdo

İskit, T. (2007). Diplomasi tarihi [History of diplomacy]. *İstanbul, Turkey: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.*

Korhan, S. (2018). Dijital diplomasi aracılığıyla tanınma çabası: Kosova örneği [The struggle of recognition by digital diplomacy: The case of Kosovo]. *Cyberpolitik Journal, 3*(6), 268–281.

Koyuncu, S., & Medin, B. (2017). Resmi aktörler bağlamında dijital kamu diplomasisi [Digital public diplomacy in the context of official actors]. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research, (3)*4, 1233–1245.

Köse, E. (2017). Dijital diplomasinin sosyo-ekonomik ve sosyo-politik yapıya etkisi [The impact of digital diplomacy on socio-economic and socio-politic structure]. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktidası ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 22*(15), 2347–2370.

Lichtenstein, J. (2010, July 16). Digital diplomacy [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/18/magazine/18web2-0-t.html?_r=0

Mytko, G. (2012, February 28). The United Kingdom and the rise of digital public diplomacy [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.exchangediplomacy.com/the-united-kingdom-and-the-rise-of-digital-public-diplomacy

Naci Koru (2011, March 4). *Digital Diplomacy* (episode 1). [Video] Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZlrrwL9Fenw

Noyan, A. (2014, January 8). Dijital diplomasinin 2013 şampiyonları ABD ve İran [Champions of digital diplomacy in 2913: USA and Iran] [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://webrazzi.com/2014/01/08/dijital-diplomasinin-2013-sampiyonlari-abd-ve-iran/

Özkan, A. (2014). *21. yüzyılın etkili iletişim yöntemi kamu diplomasisinde yumuşak güç unsuru olarak medyanın stratejik kullanımı* [The strategic use of media as a soft power element in 21st century's effective communication method public diplomacy]**.** Presented at the International Communication Science and Media Studies Congress (12-15 May 2014). Kocaeli, Turkey: Kocaeli University Faculty of Communication.

Özkan, A. (2016). Uluslararası halkla ilişkiler ve bir halkla ilişkiler etkinliği olarak kamu diplomasisi [International public relations and public diplomacy as a public relations activity]. In B. Kılınç (Ed.), *Kamu diplomasisi ve uluslararası halkla ilişkiler* [Public diplomacy and international public relations] (pp. 3–27). Eskişehir, Turkey: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Public diplomacy in the internet age (2015, February 11). [Web page post] Retrieved from http://www.yenidiplomasi.com/2015/02/internet-cagnda-kamu-diplomasisi-public.html#more

Saka, E., & Ezgin, S. A. (2016). Dijital diplomasi: Bir literatür incelemesi [Digital diplomacy: a literature review]. In B. Sunar Cankuratan (Ed.), *Uluslararası ilişkilere disiplinlerarası bir yaklaşım: Uluslararası iletişim perspektifi* [An interdisciplinary approach to international relations: International communication perspective] (pp. 55–74). İstanbul, Turkey: Röle Akademik Yayıncılık.

Sodd16. (2016, March 10). The state of digital diplomacy [Web page post]. Retrieved from http://www.sodd16.com/presidents-presidencies/

Sönmezışık, K. (2014, January 4). Siber şovalyeler [Syber Knights] [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.yenisafak.com.tr/dunya/siber-sovalyeler-601150

Telegraph. (2012, May 29). Barack Obama's 'four more years' tweet most popular ever [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/us-election/9660533/Barack-Obamas-four-more-years-tweet-most-popular-ever.html

Trace effects. (2018, March 8). [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://americanenglish.state.gov/trace-effects

Twiplomacy study 2014-update. (2014, April 26). [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2014-update/

Varoğlu, A. (2013). Kamu diplomasisinde kavramsal ve kuramsal süreç [Conceptual and theoretical process in public diplomacy]. In A. Yalçınkaya, & Y. Özgen (Eds.), *Kamu Diplomasisi* [Public diplomacy] (pp. 1–29). İstanbul, Turkey: Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Westcott, N. (2008). Digital diplomacy: The impact of the internet on international relations. *Oxford Internet Institute, Research Report 16*, 1–20. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1326476

Yılmaz, S. (2012). Akıllı güç [Smart power]. *İstanbul: Kum Saati Yayınları.*

Yücel, G. (2016). Dijital diplomasi [Digital diplomacy]. *TRT Akademi, 1*(2), 748–760.

Yüzbaşıoğlu, N. (2017, March 11). Dijital diplomasinin en iyileri Türkiye'den [The Best of Digital Diplomacy from Turkey] [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/turkiye/dijital-diplomasinin-en-iyileri-turkiyeden/781999