THESIS SUMMARY

Tóth Loretta Mária

The Pragmatics of Impoliteness
Diplomacy in 280 characters: The development
of international relations in the golden age of twiplomacy

SUPERVISOR: DR. NEMESI ATTILA LÁSZLÓ
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (PPKE BTK)

Budapest, 2021

Doctoral School of Sociology and Communication Science

Tóth Loretta Mária

The Pragmatics of Impoliteness
Diplomacy in 280 characters: The development
of international relations in the golden age of twiplomacy

THESIS SUMMARY

SUPERVISOR: DR. NEMESI ATTILA LÁSZLÓ
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (PPKE BTK)

Table of Contents

1. The Thesis' Research topic and theoretical background

This summary aims to introduce the most important findings and the relevant theoretical concepts related to the thesis of 'The Pragmatics of Impoliteness – Diplomacy in 280 character: The development of international relations in the golden age of twiplomacy'.

The aim of the dissertation is to show what effect the microblog called Twitter, one of the most active social networks in the world, have on international politics and diplomacy, referred to as the „international language of politeness" (Görög 2014: 8), in mediatized social communication. The past few years have given particular relevance to the issue; suffice it to recall the symbolic significance of the fact that on January 9, 2021, Twitter permanently suspended the former President Donald Trump's account, who refused to acknowledge the outcome of the November 2020 presidential election, citing "the risk of further incitement of violence"[1]. In a single motion, they removed the former U.S. president from the channel through which he could communicate directly; not only with American citizens, but – bypassing the traditional, well-established channels of diplomacy – with the whole world, thus ruling him out of the possibility of becoming an active shaper of American and international politics even after Joe Biden took office.

Incidentally, since the early 2010s, the academic literature has referred to this phenomenon as *twiplomacy*[2]; although the tangible consequences of this activity have so far not been as authentically (and spectacularly) represented by anyone as Donald Trump, this does not mean that he is the only one of the world leaders and diplomats who flooding the platforms of social networks with such short text messages that also have political and economic consequences. This is because Twitter has now become an unavoidable forum for „communicating" between nations (Lüfkens 2016), one of the most important tools in public diplomacy 2.0 (Harris 2013: 17), widely used by world leaders and diplomats to share short and concise messages with political and/or diplomatic contents. However, language is one of the most important tools of diplomacy. As Kishan S. Rana (2001: 108) puts it, language is considered to be the „dominant medium of diplomacy", and moreover, the statements of diplomats in the international arena are often interpreted as exact actions; therefore, Edmond Pascual (2001: 203-231), who interprets diplomatic manifestations as a speech act, following

---

[1] Source: https://blog.twitter.com/en_us/topics/company/2020/suspension (Last downloaded: 01/09/2021)

[2] The term of *twiplomacy* first appeared in a study published by a communications company called Burson-Marsteller in 2011, exclusively online, at the same time as the formation of the research group called Twiplomacy. However, there are several indications that the composition of the words of twitter and diplomacy was first used by the company's then CEO, Matthias Lüfkens, in a private panel discussion at the World Economic Forum in Davos in January 2011. Source: https://twiplomacy.com/blog/category/studies/page/6/ (Last downloaded: 01/09/2021)

the example of John Langshaw Austin (1962/1990), concludes that diplomatic communications need to be „deliberate, masterful, carefully and prudently drawn up".

But what kind of content can fit in 280 characters? There seems to be exactly enough to be sensational, more precisely, to have the ability to influence the selection and presentation of events as published news. This is because the microblog allows world leaders and diplomats to convey directly their opinions or positions on issues and developments toward the public, without the jargon and polite frameworks that are common – and expected – in traditional diplomacy. However, the present dissertation argues that it is important to keep in mind that Twitter itself would not be enough to succeed: it also needs the „help" of traditional media. Suffice it to recall that Donald Trump's particularly simple and emotionally heated statements only took minutes to tour the entire world press via Twitter. We can say, the mainstream media had longed for his vehement style of communication, which was sometimes ordinary and unusual, blatant, or even rude in the context of traditional diplomacy.

This can be explained by the fact that the click-hunting media had benefited economically from the vulgarity of the former US president, which entertained the news-reading audience (cf. Culpeper 2005) with is special language. It can also be said that the main questions and analytical aspects of the field of pragmatics have become part of the toolbox of media workers, also arousing the interest of the lay public; so impoliteness or inappropriate behavior has become an important subject of public discourse. For example, the journalist of The Atlantic American magazine notes: „as soon as Donald Trump announced his presidential candidacy, people noted a few of his linguistic quirks, such as the extended, supervowel pronunciation of huge and the references to himself in the third person. But beyond those, the version of English he speaks amounts to its own patois, with a special vocabulary and syntax and psychological substrate"[3]. And this is exactly what pragmatics deals with: broadly conceived as the cognitive, social, and cultural study of language and communication. It is „the linguistics of language use": a general cognitive, social and cultural perspective on linguistic phenomena in relation to their usage in forms of behaviour" (Verschueren 1999: 7).

As an umbrella term, pragmatics covers a broad range of diverse fields of linguistics, focusing on how people use language in order to achieve their goals (Nemesi 2013; Németh T. 2006). As Jonathan Culpeper (2010: 70–74), a linguist professor at the University of Lancaster in the United Kingdom, puts it: „pragmatics is a socio-cultural perspective on the functioning

---

[3]   https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/03/how-to-talk-trump/550934/   (Last   downloaded: 01/09/2021)

of language". And since it is an umbrella term, it is worth clarifying that the primarily „home" of this dissertation is the field of sociopragmatics, which seeks answers to how people use language to create specific, unique meanings or even to acquire specific social positions. Culpeper (2010: 70–74) divides sociopragmatics into four different hierarchical levels: at the most micro level, we find linguistic description which is not (explicitly) contextual. Above that are three layers of contextual description. These vary from pragmatics (focusing on interpersonal meanings, such as the speaker's intention behind and the hearer's uptake of a particular utterance, and so on), to social situational (focusing on situated meanings such as the roles, relations and identities performed by participants in the particular speech event), and finally to cultural (focusing ont he ideologies of speech communities, that is, the belief system of particular social groups). In this dissertation, the latter comes to the fore.

Twitter, by the way, has received a plenty of criticism from traditional media and users in recent years for providing a platform for exchanges with political and/or economic consequences. However, the microblog responded to criticism by escaping responsibility – until the former U.S. President Donald Trump's speech after the siege of the Capitol Hill on 6th January 2021, referring to an earlier blog post which is aim to help to interpret their rules on shared contents. In this, Twitter made clear, they „understand the desire for our decisions to be yes/no binaries, but it's not that simple", because, according to the argument of the technology giant, „our mission is to provide a forum that enables people to be informed and to engage their leaders directly"[4].

Thus, according to their approach, the microblog is a platform where:

o Everything we do starts with an understanding of our purpose and of the service we provide: a place where people can participate in public conversation and get informed about the world around them.

o We assess reported Tweets from world leaders against the Twitter Rules, which are designed to ensure people can participate in the public conversation freely and safely.

o We focus on the language of reported Tweets and **do not attempt to determine all potential interpretations of the content or its intent** (highlighting: T. L.).

o Presently, direct interactions with fellow public figures, comments on political issues of the day, or foreign policy saber-rattling on economic or military issues are generally not in violation of the Twitter Rules.

---

[4] Source: https://blog.twitter.com/en_us/topics/company/2019/worldleaders2019 (Last downloaded: 01/09/2021)

- o However, if a Tweet from a world leader does violate the Twitter Rules but there is a clear public interest value to keeping the Tweet on the service, we may place it behind a notice that provides context about the violation and allows people to click through should they wish to see the content.

While each of the arguments behind their approach is important separately, the most notable is the principle set out in the third point that they focus solely on the language of the tweets, not the intentions behind a particular statement, i.e., not the meta- and sociopragmatic meanings. However, in January 2021, like Facebook, the former president's account was suspended indefinitely for metapragmatic reasons, citing the supposed intention behind his statement. Among other things, they argued: the use of the words of „American Patriots" by Trump to describe of his supporters „**is also being interpreted** as support for those committing violent acts at the US Capitol" (highlighting: T. L.)

While each of the arguments behind their rules is important individually, the most notable is the principle set out in the third point: they focus exlusively „the language of reported tweets and do not attempt to determine all potential interpretations of the content or its intent". Nevertheless, in January 2021, in conjuction with Facebook, the former president's account was suspended indefinitely for metapragmatic reasons, citing the supposed intent behind his statement. They argued that after the events at the Capitol, they feared that the then US president would incite his followers to violence again[5].

However, the dissertation does not aim to determine why the events of 6 January 2021 led Twitter management to reconsider its guidelines for world leaders, published on 15 October 2019, nor why they chose to suspend the profile of a then-governing president because of the presumption of the intentions behind his utterances. But Donald Trump's case provides an excellent support for the dissertation's argument that pragmatics, which seeks to explore interpretations of speaker intentions and utterances, should play a much more prominent role in the interpretation and study of international relations and mediated diplomacy. Moreover, in case of twiplomacy, pragmatics can provide an appropriate toolbox for the scientific objectivity regarding the control of moderation deployed by Twitter. Thus, this dissertation, with a background in communication science, is an attempt to establish a bridge between the approaches of interpersonal dimensions of communication, building on work from discursive (social)psychology and linguistic pragmatics, and international relations, focusing on

---

[5] Twitter's argument in this regard can be found at the following link: https://blog.twitter.com/en_us/topics/company/2020/suspension (Last downloaded: 01/09/2021)

diplomacy. Because although there has been a number of pragmatic research in recent decades that, at least regarding the corpus, has reflected diplomacy (see, for example, Pascual 2001, Rhana 2001) or political communication, its theoretical considerations and results have not yet been discovered by theorists who dealing with international relations. This is despite the fact that in many cases, pragmatics and especially the (im)politeness theories are could provide an appropriate framework for interpreting situations between nations, more precisely, world leaders or diplomats who are representing a nation – as it is illustrated by the examples in the dissertation.

Primarily for this reason, but also motivated by the intention to systematize the most defining theories of the field in Hungarian, the dissertation provides a thorough overview of the most important milestones of (im)politeness research in the last three decades. This is followed by the introduction of the context that serves as the basis for the analysis of this thesis: the focus will be on diplomacy and communication between nations, touching upon the Web 2.0's impact on traditional diplomacy. In addition, according to this dissertation, the link between (im)politeness theories and international relations is powered by the concept of *face*, introduced into sociopragmatics by the Canadian sociologist Erving Goffman (1955). Following the argument of Kádár, Haugh and Chang (2013), I will attempt to extend the concept of face to nations in order to show its relevance in mediatized diplomacy. After a well-founded introduction of the political philosophical and socio-psychological definitions of the concept of national face, I will argue that national face plays a key role in mediatized diplomatic conflicts and their emergence.

The scientific literature defines diplomacy as the conduct of international relations by negotiation and dialogue or by any other means to promote peaceful relations among nations (i.e. Kissinger 1994/2008). But on Twitter, the utterances and public statements by diplomats and heads of states have both a domestic internal audience and an internationally mediated one, and which are, in varying complex ways, part of the mediated "conversation" that constitues the ongoing discourse between publics and governments, and governments and governments. Based on this, the hypothesis of this dissertation is that the discourse of mediatized diplomacy between nations is organized around negotiatons on national face, and in this sense, twiplomacy is ultimately nothing more than nationalface-work.

With this in mind, in the dissertation I will define the national face as positive social values constructed from collective traits and national characteristics, by which the members of a particular nation identify themselves, by which they want to represent themselves to other (members of) nations, and whose recognition is expected from other (members of) nations. It

follows that the term of nationalface-work refers to the negotiation of international relations at different levels of the geopolitical context (which can sometimes mean the interaction of individuals with different ranks), recognizing that perceived or actual threats of the national face, in some cases, even may cause political and/or economic consequences.

The dissertation also attempts to categorize the phenomenon of twiplomacy, focusing on what goals and intentions (i.e. Culpeper 2011b) motivate world leaders and diplomats to use the microblog in order to convey their political and diplomatic messages for others. By prersenting detailed case studies, I seek answers to the unique features of tweets that, in the context of mediatized diplomacy, can modify or even completely change official international relations negotiated through traditional channels of diplomacy, that is, they may result concrete political and/or economic consequences. In doing so, I also try to explain why it is extremely important that the mass men (Ellul 1962) also has appeared in mediatized diplomacy as an active participant: becoming a part of the interaction, looking behind the scenes, the general public became an active shaper of geopolitical processes thanks to the their meta-participant status. (Kádár – Haugh 2013).

Although only Donald Trump has been cited as an example so far, this is simply because these days Twitter, the phenomenon of twiplomacy and its spectacular role in shaping international relations, is almost merged with the name of the former American president. However, the phenomenon goes far beyond Trump, which is why the dissertation does not aim to put the communication characteristics of the former president at the center of the analysis. Due to the global nature of the phenomenon, the repertoire is much broader – not a closed corpus created for quantitative processing, but an immersion from message exchanges on Twitter that have sparked a lot of attention in the international press.

2. Hypotheses and Research Questions

In recent years, motivated mainly by Donald Trump's use of Twitter, there has been a proliferation of articles and analyzes on Twitter communication in the international press, arguing that the phenomenon of twiplomacy – and indirectly the public diplomacy[6] – has profoundly subverted the communication of traditional diplomacy. However, in the scientific literature, beyond the work of the Twiplomacy Research Group[7], which focuses solely on empirical data collection and is therefore non-theoretical, it is much more difficult to find a serious and ideological-free in-depth scientific study of twiplomacy. This is despite the fact that there is a wealth of literature on world leaders use of social media, for instance, with the purpose of self-branding, and nation branding or the personalization of political communication have also inspired many researchers over the past decade. There are some refreshing exceptions that focus on Twitter and twiplomacy, but the vast majority of them – albeit from different aspects – focus on the former U.S. president.

And although there are indirect observations in these works of how nations and world leaders use Twitter as a tool for public diplomacy or for self presentation (cf. Goffman 1959, 1967), the multifaceted phenomenon of twiplomacy has not yet been systematically examined, and so far only speculative analyzes have been made of how world leaders use social networks to communicate and validate real diplomatic goals. So far, no attempt has been made to explain why the communication of traditional diplomacy has disturbed by the new media, if at all.

Based on the above, the dissertation attempts to prove two main hypotheses, these are:

1) While the aim of traditional diplomacy is to manage international relations by negotiation and dialogue, supporting the partner's national face, the mediatized diplomacy is rather organized around negotiatons on national face, in which for a nation, protecting its own nation's face is far more important than protecting its partner's national face.

---

[6] The term *"public diplomacy"* was coined in 1965 by Edmund Gullion, dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University and a distinguished retired foreign service officer, when he established an Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy. According to his definition, public diplomacy deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication, as diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the process of intercultural communications (Simon-Nagy 2012).

[7] See more: https://twiplomacy.com (Last downloaded: 01/09/2021)

2) In the context of mediatized diplomacy, tweets can be seen as a social practice that can support, modify, or even completely change official relations negotiated through traditional channels of diplomacy in the diplomatic discourse.

The research questions of the dissertation are the following:

- What are the distinguishing features of Twitter posts published by world leaders that can modify or even change official international relations negotiated through traditional channels of diplomacy, and can cause political and/or economic consequences?

- Who are the real recipients of world leaders 'Twitter posts?

- Does it affect interactions that Twitter limits the length of a post to 280 characters which is not even able to convey non-verbal messages for the recipients?

- Can the scientific theories and results of (socio)pragmatics, which have so far focused on interpersonal interactions, be extended to the level of social communication?

After the hypotheses and research questions, it is worth clarifying the limitations of the dissertation: since the second wave of (im)politeness theories, it has been an axiom that when interpreting a particular (conflicting) situation, it is essential to take into account the perceptions of the recipient, since the emotional reaction to a particular utterance always determines how to interpret it. In many cases, the real intention of an utterance or behaviour can only be inferred from the responses to it (Culpeper 2011b). In mediatized diplomacy, however, Twitter posts by diplomats or world leaders may trigger tens of thousands of reactions, not to mention that the messages of diplomats and world leaders are further conveyed by the traditional media, thus rendering immeasurable all the interpretive frameworks that occur. A qualitative, pragmatic examination of such a corpus would thus stretch the scope of the dissertation, and softwares suitable for the quantitative processing of a large number of data sets is not appropriate for detecting pragmatic meanings, which play a key role in this thesis. A thorough and in-depth examination of a single case, such as one that would focus on Donald Trump, would also not bring us closer to answering research questions about the well-identified generalities of the phenomenon of twiplomacy. Therefore, we will seek to gain an "impression" and draw conclusions based on the most common receptive perceptions through several case studies, while by thoroughly describing the contexts, we seek to facilitate an understanding of a wide range of possible interpretations.

3. Methodology

For more than 50 years, Graham Allison's (1971) original study of a single case, the 1962 Cuban missile crisis – in which the U.S.–Soviet Union confrontation could have produced nuclear holocaust – has been a political science best-seller. The book posits three competing but also complementary theories to explain the crisis – that the United States and Soviet Union performed as (a) rational actors, (b) complex bureaucracies, or (c) politically motivated groups of persons. Allison compares the ability of each one to explain the course of events in the crisis: why the Soviet Union placed offensive (and not merely defensive) missiles in Cuba in the first place, and why the United States responed to the missile deployment with a blockade (and not an air strike or invasion – the missiles already were in Cuba), and why the Soviet Union eventually withdrew the missiles. The case study shows the explanatory and not just descriptive or exploratory functions of single-case studies. Furthermore, the lessons from the case study are intended to be generalizable not only to forreign affairs more broadly but also to a whole variety of complex governmental actions. In this way, the book forcefully demonstrates how a single-case study can be the basis for significant explanations and generalizations.

A case study is a research approach in which one or a few instances of a phenomenon are studied in depth. Case studies were the predominant research approach at the beginning of modern social science. This is reflected, for example, in the work of the Austrian- born anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski and the Chicago School of sociology, both of which embraced case study research. Nevertheless, after World War II, quantitative methods gained a hegemonic position, at least among methodologists. But, as Lisa M. Given (2008: 68) points out, in the last two decades, we have seen not only a resurgence of case studies in most disciplines but also unprecedented methodological reflection on this approach. Since the early 2000s, there has been a resurgence in the use of case studies in most social sciences, including sociology and psychology, due to the appreciation of researchers' individual perceptions of in-depth interviews and discourse analysis studies. Moreover, it has now become a generally accepted view in the social sciences that case studies may be the main source of theoretical innovation, while quantitative studies that accumulate large amounts of data have the advantage of controlling the empirical scope of new theoretical concepts. And even proponents of the positivist methodology acknowledge that a case study has several advantages in terms of the depth of an analysis (Given: 68–70). The biggest difference between the two methods is that the application of the case study "forces" the researcher to have a theory or concept on the topic

to be studied in advance before any data collection, and other forms of research than the case study do not provide such an opportunity to interpret the meanings (Yin 2003: 28–30). However, this is also a disadvantage of this method, as the hypotheses and concepts that precede the research may even influence the outcome of the analysis; this is why one of the most common criticisms of case studies is that the individual perception of the researcher / observer is given too much emphasis in the inference process. However, given that it is a social science, maximum objectivity should not be the goal of (impoliteness) research which deals with examining the emotions and attitudes of others. Nevertheless, in this thesis, the most accurate formalization of the observations was also defined as an important goal during the interpretation of particular meanings.

As we have predicted, the phenomenon of twiplomacy has now become a global and common phenomenon. However, since all twiplomatic conflicts between world leaders are unique and unrepeatable depending on the history of diplomatic relations, and consequently unpredictable in their outcome, the dissertation attempts to draw causal conclusions by selecting several cases comparable by their similarity or difference. The corpus thus consists of Twitter statements that triggered a great deal of attention in the international press, and faithfully illustrate the (im)politeness phenomena that are relevant to us. The variability of world leaders and nations was also an important consideration in the selection of cases, so that instead of observing individual patterns (e.g., Donald Trump), we could draw as general conclusions as possible about twiplomacy as a social practice.

For the analysis, the sociocultural analysis framework introduced by Kádár and Haugh (2013), which was explained in detail in the dissertation, proved to be the most appropriate. Although, if it facilitates the interpretation of the context, the results and lessons of other theories of (im)politeness are also included in the analysis.

With this in mind, the dissertation defines the following four categories of twiplomacy:

1) *pure diplomacy:* when world leaders or diplomats in a conflict-oriented or pre-existing conflict situation express their intention to de-escalate the situation and propose a possible negotiated solution by a particular tweet, instead of waiting for a solution bargaining by the slow channels of traditional diplomacy.

2) *representative twiplomacy:* when a tweet is used exclusively to inform the (mediatized) public about state affairs, international relations, or the official position of a particular nation on a particular matter.

3) *entertaining twiplomacy:* when there is no diplomatic goal or motivation for world leaders or diplomats with a particular tweet, it only serves to entertain the audience

and/or thematize the (click-hunter) media, or using a tweet with a purpose of self and/or nation branding.

4) *domestically motivated twiplomacy:* when the tweet of a world leader or diplomat appears to be addressed to an other world leader or diplomat, but the real addressee is the domestic audience, that is, the domestic (traditional) media and the voter who ensures his/her own power and position.

It is worth noting here that, as we will see in the case studies of the dissertation, in real situations the four categories of twiplomacy cannot always be so sharply separated: in many cases there are overlaps, and hybrid variations of categories may also occur, as, for example, the intention to thematize traditional media may be important considerations in many cases that are categorized in other categories by the present typology in addition to entertainment. Nevertheless, segregating tweets published by representatives of nations in this way provides an opportunity to get closer to the primary motivations and intentions why world leaders and diplomats are increasingly using Twitter these days. Even before a close examination of the specific cases, it is clear that the definition of (1) pure twiplomacy is the closest, and the definition of (4) domestically motivated twiplomacy is the farest way from traditional diplomacy. The latter is much closer to political communication aimed at retaining or gaining power (Mazzoleni 2002) in its intention, but in the age of public diplomacy 2.0, new media and especially Twitter, the age of diplomacy behind closed doors is seemingly coming to an end, since social networks have now blurred the boundaries between political communication and mediatized diplomacy.

However, as the second wave of (im)politeness research has rightly pointed out, it is essential to take into account the perceptions of the recipient when interpreting a situation, because an emotional reaction to a behaviour or utterance always determines how it is to be interpreted. A real intention can often only be inferred from reactions to it (cf. Culpeper 2011b) – and it works the same way in computer mediated communication on social networks. That is why, in analyzing the tweets of world leaders and diplomats in the dissertation, we also take into account how others have interpreted the message they intend to convey. More specifically, we will examine what schemas (cf. Culpeper 2011b) and moral orders (Kádár – Haugh 2013) in the reactions to the analyzed tweets are behind the opinion and position of the audience is articulated. Therefore, based on the concept of the moral order of Kádár and Haugh (2013: 58–60), the dissertation defines the following schema dimensions in terms the values, expectations and "common knowledge" along which the evaluative attitudes can be articulated on Twitter,

in order to understand the dynamic intersection of micro, interactional concerns with macro, socio historical discourses about national face (Kádár–Haugh– Chang 2013: 58-60).

1) Don't interfere! This is our domestic affair / This is their domestic affair.

2) You bring shame to our nation!

3) Don't just talk, act!

4) We are not in a position to morally criticize them; You are not in a position to morally criticize us.

5) Why are you dealing with this when you have more important things to do?

One of the most common criticisms of theorists in the field of (im)politeness research in recent decades has been that their classification or categorization systems does not have a well-defined framework that prevents them from being expanded with more and more elements. This dissertations's attempt to categorize the reactions of world leaders and diplomats' tweets is also can certainly be further expanded or even narrowed down to other aspects, however it can provide a good starting point for exploring the schemas and moral orders contained in the case studies examined on the phenomenon of twiplomacy.

4. Results

Based on the case studies examined in the dissertation, the results of the dissertation can be summarized according to the following points:

- It is clear that the first of the categories we have defined in Chapter 5, i.e. the domestically motivated twiplomacy is the one that occurs most often in the Twitter posts analyzed. Based on this, it can be concluded that the microblog, and the phenomenon of twiplomacy has primarily broadened the toolbox of political communication in mediatized communication much more than of diplomacy.

- Of the 25 Twitter entries examined in the dissertation, only two cases proved that world leaders and diplomats used Twitter as a medium for diplomatic *purpose*s, that is, it coincided with the category we defined as pure diplomacy. Based on this, although the immersion is not representative, so further empirical evidence is needed, it can be concluded that while the traditional media and the public like to believe that world leaders and diplomats use Twitter for diplomatic purposes, thus overshadowing the traditional diplomacy, in fact, actors in the international arena do not use Twitter to communicate and validate their diplomatic goals, much more to convince their own domestic audience, so the term twiplomacy is at least misleading in this sense.

- One of the research questions of the dissertation sought to answer the question of what are the distinguishing features of Twitter posts published by world leaders that can modify or even change official international relations negotiated through traditional channels of diplomacy, and can cause political and/or economic consequences. Regarding to this, three lessons can be learned from the case studies:

  1) Based on the case study detailed in Chapter 6.1, it can be concluded that in a conflict situation, Twitter can prove to be an extremely useful tool in conveying information, thereby facilitating escalation or de-escalation. Thus, tweets in the category defined as pure twiplomacy are able to modify the outcome of a situation in a critical crisis and thus have political and / or economic consequences.

  2) A sociopragmatic analysis of the twiplomatic conflicts that have caused a great deal of publicity in recent years shows not only that the vast majority of these posts fall into the category of domestically motivated twiplomacy, but also that Twitter posts of this kind are, in most cases are articulated along an existing conflict that is also being negotiated through traditional diplomatic channels. So these tweets don't overwrite or modify traditional diplomatic relations – they only confirm it.

- The second research question of the dissertation sought to answer to who can be considered as the primary recipients of Twitter messages posted by world leaders and diplomats. It follows from the overrepresentation of domestically motivated twiplomacy that although geopolitical actors representing nations seem to have a "dialogue" with each other on the microblog, the real recipients of the messages are primarily the domestic audience, that is, the voter who ensure the power and position of the world leaders and diplomats and the domestic traditional media. Thus, the sets of expectations of the domestic public arising from the moral order in the discourse of mediated diplomacy always overwrite the sets of expectations arising from the moral order of the international public, that is, the citizens of other nations. This also means that domestic political interests override foreign policy interests.

- The last research question of the dissertation sought to answer the question of whether the scientific theories and analytical aspects of (socio) pragmatics, which have so far focused only on interpersonal interactions, can be extended to the level of social communication. Based on the conclusions drawn from the case studies on twiplomacy and the nature of mediated diplomacy, we argue that the socio-cultural analysis framework that allows (im)politeness to be interpreted as social practices, is able to better understand the outcome of conflict situations between nations and world leaders representing nations.

The conclusions drawn from the case studies, however, need further proof: an empirical study demonstrating the overwhelming dominance of domestically mnotivated twiplomacy is the goal of further research.

5. References

Allison, T. Graham (1971) *The Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Boston: Little-Brown.

Austin, John L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Magyarul: *Tetten ért szavak*. Ford.: Pléh Csaba. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1990.]

Culpeper, Jonathan (2005) Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 1/1: 35–72.

Culpeper, Jonathan (2010) Historical sociopragmatics. In: Jucker, Andreas H. – Taavitsainen, Irma (szerk.): *Historical Pragmatics*. *Handbooks of Pragmatics 8*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 69–96.

Culpeper, Jonathan (2011a) *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckert, P. – McConell-Ginet, S. (1998) Communities of Practice: where language, gender and power all live. In: Coates, J. (szerk.): *Language and Gender: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 484–494.

Ellul, Jacques (1962) *Propaganda – The formations of men's attitudes*. New York: Vintages Books.

Goffman, Erving (1955) On face-work. *Psychiatry* 18: 213 – 231. [Magyarul: A homlokzatról. In: Síklaki István (szerk.): *Szóbeli befolyásolás II*. *Nyelv és szituáció*. Budapest: Typotex, 2008, 11–36.]

Goffman, Erving (1959) *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City (NY): Doubleday Anchor. [Magyarul: Az én bemutatása a mindennapi életben. Budapest: Pólya]

Goffman, Erving (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior*. New York: Garden City, Anchor Books.

Given, Lisa M. (2008) *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publications.

Görög Ibolya (2014) *Protokoll az életem*. Budapest: Athenaeum Kiadó Kft.

Harris, Britney (2013) Diplomacy 2.0: The Future of Social Media in Nation Branding. In: The *Journal of Public Diplomacy*, 4 (1), Article 3. https://surface.syr.edu/exchange/vol4/iss1/3 (Utolsó letöltés ideje: 2021. augusztus 19.)

Kádár Dániel Zoltán–Haugh, Michael (2013) *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Kádár Dániel Zoltán–Haugh, Michael–Chang, Weilin M. (2013) Aggression and perceived national facethreats in Mainland Chinese and Taiwanese. *Multilingua:* 32, 343–372.

Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Locher, Miriam A.–Richard J. Watts (2005) Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 1 (1): 9–33.

Mazzoleni, Gianpietro (2002) *Politikai kommunikáció*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Nemesi Attila László (2013) A pragmatika mint kommunikációtudomány. *Magyar Nyelv*, 109/2: 177–184.

Németh T. Enikő (2006) Pragmatika. In: Kiefer Ferenc (szerk.): *Magyar nyelv*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 222–261.

Pascual, Edmond (2001) Pragmatics in diplomatic exchanges. Jovan Kurbalija–Hannah Slavik (szerk.): *Language and diplomacy.* Malta: University of Malta, 225–232.

Rana, S. Kishan (2001) Language, signalling and Diplomacy. In: Jovan Kurbalija–Hannah Slavik (szerk.): *Language and diplomacy.* Malta: University of Malta, 107–116.

Simon-Nagy Lilla (2012) *Nyilvános diplomácia*. Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem. Forrás: http://phd.lib.uni-corvinus.hu/705/1/Simon_Nagy_Lilla.pdf (Utolsó letöltés ideje: 2021. május 29.)

Van Dijk, Teun A. (1987) *Communicating racism: Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. London: SAGE Publications.

Verschueren, Jef (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Yin, K. Robert (2003) *Case Study Research – Desing and Methods*. London/New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

6. Publications by the author on the research topic

Tóth Loretta (2013) Hogyan szórakoztat az udvariatlanság? Az offenzív viselkedés megjelenése a Magyar Televízió kvízműsoraiban. *Médiakutató*, 14 (1): 7–17.

Tóth Loretta (2014) Prozódia és udvariatlanság az „X-faktor" interakcióiban. *Médiakutató*, 15 (4): 51–64.

Tóth Loretta (2016) Arculat és udvariatlanság a társalgás interakcióiban. *Magyar Pszichológiai Szemle*, 71 (3): 497–511.

Tóth Loretta (2016) Diplomácia, a jelentések harcszíntere. In: Balázs Géza – Pölcz Ádám (szerk.): *Udvariasság: szemiotika, művészet, irodalom, nyelv*. Budapest: Magyar Szemiotikai Társaság, 203–211.

Tóth Loretta (2017) Udvariatlanság és genderidentitás. *Replika* 2017/3: 103, 99–111.