

Taiwan's Digital Public Diplomacy Towards Indonesia in Supporting its New Southbound Policy

Diplomasi Publik Digital Taiwan terhadap Indonesia dalam Mendukung Kebijakan Baru Arah Selatan

Rika Isnarti

International Relations Department, Universitas Pertamina

Email: rika.isnarti@universitaspertamina.ac.id

Riwayat Artikel

Diterima: 3 April 2023
Direvisi: 24 Oktober 2023
Disetujui: 2 November 2023
doi: 10.22212/jp.v14i2.3858

Abstract

This research aims to analyze Taiwan's digital public diplomacy to Indonesia and generally in ASEAN countries in supporting Taiwan's New Southbound Policy. It concerns elaborating and assessing to what extent digital diplomacy can assist Taiwan in achieving its new southbound policy goals and its limitations. This paper assesses Taiwan government's social media, especially the Ministry of Foreign Affairs official social media and other digital media platforms that have been used to promote and inform New Southbound Policy and the president's social media accounts. It employs digital diplomacy in International Relations as a conceptual framework that is part of public diplomacy. This research is a qualitative content analysis, that analyzed terms such as New Southbound Policy, Indonesia, and Taiwan. The study found that Taiwan's digital public diplomacy support its New Southbound Policy towards Indonesia in term of, but is not limited to, resource sharing, people-to-people exchange, and promoting institutional links. It meets digital diplomacy efficiency and objectives. Taiwan's digital diplomacy can achieve its agenda-setting and presence expansion but limited in generating optimal conversation. Those media platforms used in Taiwan's digital diplomacy, can meet digital diplomacy objectives that are delivery of information, consular service, and engagement and expand the network.

Keywords: *Taiwan; Indonesia; New Southbound Policy; Digital Diplomacy; Social Media.*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis diplomasi publik digital Taiwan di Indonesia dan umumnya di negara-negara ASEAN dalam mendukung Kebijakan Baru Arah Selatan Taiwan. Ini berkaitan untuk menguraikan dan menilai sejauh mana diplomasi digital dapat membantu Taiwan dalam mencapai tujuan Kebijakan Baru Arah Selatan dan keterbatasannya. Tulisan ini menilai media sosial pemerintah Taiwan, khususnya media sosial resmi Kementerian Luar Negeri dan platform media digital lainnya yang telah digunakan untuk mempromosikan dan menginformasikan Kebijakan Baru Arah Selatan dan akun media sosial presiden. Ini menggunakan diplomasi digital dalam Hubungan Internasional sebagai kerangka konseptual yang merupakan bagian dari diplomasi publik. Penelitian ini merupakan analisis konten kualitatif, yang menganalisis istilah-istilah seperti Kebijakan Baru Arah Selatan, Indonesia, dan Taiwan. Studi ini menemukan bahwa diplomasi publik digital Taiwan mendukung Kebijakan Baru Arah Selatan terhadap Indonesia dalam hal, tetapi tidak terbatas pada, pembagian sumber daya, pertukaran orang-ke-orang, dan mempromosikan hubungan kelembagaan. Ini memenuhi efisiensi dan tujuan diplomasi digital. Diplomasi digital Taiwan dapat mencapai penetapan agenda dan

perluasan kehadirannya tetapi terbatas pada optimalisasi dalam menghasilkan percakapan. Platform media yang digunakan dalam diplomasi digital Taiwan tersebut, dapat memenuhi tujuan diplomasi digital yaitu penyampaian informasi, layanan konsuler, dan keterlibatan serta memperluas jaringan.

Kata Kunci: Taiwan; Indonesia; Kebijakan Baru Arah Selatan; Diplomasi Digital; Media Sosial.

Introduction

This research analyses Taiwan's digital public diplomacy in Indonesia in supporting Taiwan's New Southbound Policy. It seeks Taiwan's digital diplomacy structure, how the government promotes New Southbound Policy spirit in Indonesia, which policy goals are being pursued by utilizing digital public diplomacy. It assesses to what extent digital diplomacy can assist Taiwan in achieving its New Southbound Policy goals and its limitations.

Going south is not new in Taiwan's foreign policy. According to Glaser since the 1990s, Taiwan's leader had included Southeast Asia and/or South Asia in their economic strategic road map¹. For example, under Lee's presidency, go south policy or southward policy was launched. Under Chen's presidency, there was a second go south policy, and there was 10 plus 3 plus 1 under President Ma. Most of them focused on economy. However, New Southbound Policy focuses on facilitating Taiwan's presence in and link to the regions and reposition Taiwan in a more strategic place with fewer political barriers. The New Southbound Policy is introduced by President Tsai Ing-wen aimed to strengthen Taiwan relations across the Indo-Pacific. Ten countries of ASEAN, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bhutan, Australia, and New Zealand are the targeted countries of this policy.

It has long-term and short to mid-term goals. In short to mid-term, it aims to develop

¹ Bonnie Glaser et al., *The New southbound policy: Deepening Taiwan's Regional Integration*, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2018, 12.

economic and trade relations, investment, tourism, culture and talent, encouraging industry to adopt a new southbound strategy.² It also aims to cultivate more people with the skills needed to support the New Southbound Policy and expand multilateral and bilateral negotiation, and dialogue to enhance economic cooperation and resolve disputes and disagreements. The New Southbound Policy generally wants to have strong ties, economic development, and market expansion, promote culture, government, and private sector collaboration and people-to-people ties with targeted countries³. These areas will be assessed in this paper, how Taiwan's digital diplomacy promotes these objectives.

Indonesia is one of the targeted countries of the New Southbound Policy. There are many Indonesians in Taiwan, both as skilled workers and students. For many years both countries have had good relations. Having strong ties with this country can give positive benefits to Taiwan. However, not many Indonesians know about the New Southbound Policy or even Taiwan. Some people assume Taiwan as Thailand or sometimes Taiwan is part of People's Republic of China. A high number of Indonesians are familiar with social media and spend much time on it. Considering this benefit and opportunity and under the policy, the Taiwan's government has the opportunity to promote the policy in Indonesia via digital diplomacy by using social media. Thus, this

² Bureau of Foreign Trade, "New southbound policy Implementation Plans," last modified 2016, accessed April 4, 2018, <https://newsouthboundpolicy.trade.gov.tw/English/PageDetail?pageID=50&nodeID=94>.

³ <https://doaj.org/article/d5d65a3334364617b3193db207c57f77>.

paper assesses how Taiwan's government promotes the New Southbound Policy towards Indonesia by utilizing digital diplomacy?

Conceptual Framework

This part explains the definition of digital diplomacy as part of public diplomacy, its mechanism, or how digital diplomacy works, its impact, and how to assess its effectiveness. Before analyzing Taiwan's digital diplomacy, it is important to have a clear definition and what area digital diplomacy works. Digital diplomacy cannot be separated from the development of information and technology. The extend development of the internet has changed the practice of diplomacy. With the emergence of globalization, diplomacy does not merely focus on politics like before in the Cold War and economic diplomacy like in 1970⁴. Like a foreign policy that has many interests', diplomacy as a foreign policy instrument also has many tools and aims. Public diplomacy is conducted to gain more soft power like culture, communication, science, people exchange, global links, and many more. Recently, many states would like to gain as much as in soft power.

Public diplomacy as a nation-state's attempt to influence the opinions and attitudes of foreign publics⁵. In addition, public diplomacy is an effort by the government of one nation to influence public or elite opinion in a second nation to turn the foreign policy of the targeted nation to advantage⁶. Regarding the development of technology, public diplomacy links international affairs with communications, image, and information and communications technologies (ICT); thus ICT cannot be denied as a tool in doing public diplomacy or more known by digital

diplomacy. For this research purpose, digital public diplomacy can be defined as a nation state's attempt to achieve foreign policy by influencing the public or elite opinion of the targeted country that can utilize ICT and people links.

Public diplomacy is also no longer done by government officials themselves. It also can be done by people to people, industry, and private sectors. However, the government cannot be denied still the main actor. In doing so, many ways are done by the government, for example by managing news, excellent communication with targeted foreign public⁷, doing an exchange, listening, and international broadcasting⁸, mobilizing think tanks, working together with industry and business sector, inviting foreign scholars and others⁹.

In digital public diplomacy, the government should maximize the role of the internet such as managing the government's official website. A web page should be informative and include news. A country that does its news management could frame its image to the external public who read news both online or offline. Besides, the government should manage social media. For example, when government officers hold town meeting in different regions and cities and upload the activities to their social media, it could also be an indicator of digital public diplomacy. Sometimes, social media history from an account shows their concern about a particular issue and also attract people's attention to them and their country.

Before we go in-depth about digital diplomacy, first let us have a look at what diplomacy is. Diplomacy could be seen as "the conduct of relations between states and other entities with standing in world politics

4 Kishan S Rana, *21st Century Diplomacy : A Practitioner's Guide*, 2011.

5 Haluk Karadag, "Forcing the Common Good: The Significance of Public Diplomacy in Military Affairs," *Armed Forces & Society* 43, no. 1 (2017): 72-91.

6 Rana, *21st Century Dipl. A Pract. Guide*.

7 Mark Leonard, "Diplomacy by Other Means," *Foreign Policy*, no. 132 (2002): 48-56.

8 Nicholas J. Cull, "Public Diplomacy: Seven Lessons for Its Future from Its Past," *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 6, no. 1 (February 16, 2010): 11-17.

9 Rana, *21st Century Dipl. A Pract. Guide*.

by official agents and by peaceful means”¹⁰. The official agents, as stated by them, make diplomacy narrow in today's practices. Today, more people might be said to be doing diplomacy, but they are not diplomats. For example, tourists and exchange students who to some extent are representatives for their home countries but they are not diplomats. Meanwhile, people in the visited countries could learn something to their home countries. Other scholars define diplomacy more broadly that could be suitable with today's practice. Adesina defines diplomacy as a method by which states articulate their foreign policy objectives and coordinate their efforts to influence the decisions and behavior of foreign governments and peoples through dialogue, negotiations and other such measures to avoid short of war and violence¹¹.

Some people say there is no significant difference between digital diplomacy and traditional diplomacy. Digital diplomacy differs from traditional diplomacy only in terms of the delivery of information that becomes faster because of technology. Technology has enabled the news to become faster, more readily available, and able to reach almost every part of the world. As we know that news is the base material of foreign policy and the way governments interact with each other. Therefore, the interactions of governments, which are the purpose of diplomacy, now are also being affected by faster, and potentially more far-reaching information and news. However, digital diplomacy does not only change the delivery of information, but diplomacy's tools also become various. Diplomacy audience is not only limited to foreign affairs staff or government but also

society which makes diplomacy become public recently.

According to Cull, public diplomacy is an international actor's attempt to manage the global environment through engagement with a foreign public¹². Paul in Melissen also defines public diplomacy as the process by which direct relations with people in a country are pursued to advance the interests and extend the values of those being represented¹³. Meanwhile Tuch defines public diplomacy as a government's process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about an understanding of its nation's ideas and ideals, its institutions, and culture, as well as its national goals and current policies¹⁴. From these definitions, we can conclude that public diplomacy is not a stately activity. Public diplomacy can be undertaken by nontraditional actors like NGOs, scholars, people, and others. In public diplomacy, information is gathered from foreign public and policy formulated from the information is also aimed at them. To conclude, public diplomacy is a foreign policy method performed by officials and nonofficials of states, by building direct relations with the public to bring understanding, ideas, and ideals about its origin states.

Cull¹⁵ and Melissen¹⁶ add information as an essential point in public diplomacy. Information is the primary material that has to be delivered to the foreign public about

10 H Bull, A Hurrell, and S Hoffman, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (Columbia University Press, 2002).

11 Olubukola S Adesina, “Foreign Policy in an Era of Digital Diplomacy,” *Cogent social sciences* 3, no. 1 (2017), <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/23311886.2017.1297175>.

12 Cull, “Public Diplomacy: Seven Lessons for Its Future from Its Past”; Nicholas J Cull, “The Long Road to Public Diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US Public Diplomacy,” *International Studies Review* 15, no. 1 (2013): 123–139.

13 Dr Melissen Jan, *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

14 Hans N Tuch, *Communicating with the World U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas*, 1990.

15 Sherry Lee Mueller, “The Nexus of U.S. Public Diplomacy and Citizen Diplomacy,” in *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, ed. Nancy Snow and Nicholas John Cull (Routledge, 2020).

16 J Melissen, “The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations,” *Choice Reviews Online* 44, no. 03, *Studies in Diplomacy and International Relations* (2006): 44-1781-44-1781.

states who conduct public diplomacy and information is also material gathered from the foreign publics, especially about their perception of the state performing public diplomacy. By delivering information and collecting information's ideas, understanding can be built by interaction parties in public diplomacy. Recently, information is delivered through the internet. Therefore, many scholars said that public diplomacy could be done through the internet. So, people know digital diplomacy as diplomacy conducted on the internet. Hence, digital diplomacy is part of public diplomacy as its interaction held on the internet, gathers as much as information and diplomats interact directly with foreign publics on the internet via many platforms.

Many names have been given to refer to the use of digital platforms in diplomacy, for example, social media diplomacy, Twitter diplomacy (*twiplomacy*), cyber diplomacy, e-diplomacy, net diplomacy, diplomacy 2.0, webdiplomacy, and more. E-diplomacy derives from electronic diplomacy. Presumably, using cable wire can be classified as electronic¹⁷. Hence, using cable wire such as telephone, radio, and electronic letters for diplomatic purposes can be clarified as electronic diplomacy or electronic diplomacy. This practice is not something new today. It has been practiced for many years. If we use this term, it also means, there is nothing new in digital diplomacy, only changing names. Cyber diplomacy has an ambiguous meaning¹⁸. Cyber diplomacy could be meant to use diplomacy to solve cyber problems. For example, state A accused of doing espionage on state B. Then, both parties meet together and do

negotiation, mediation, and other diplomatic means. Thus, cyber diplomacy is the use of diplomatic resources and the performance of diplomatic functions to secure national interests concerning cyberspace. Social media diplomacy and Twitter diplomacy will narrow the practice of digital diplomacy. It could only mean using social media, particularly Twitter, to gain state interests. As a result, other tools such as websites, teleconferences, and smart applications on the phone, will be less significant.

Some scholars define digital diplomacy as diplomacy on the internet and other digital media. Madu says that digital diplomacy is how governments and their diplomats use the internet, smartphones, and social media as part of managing international relations, again in their national interest¹⁹. Adesina defines digital diplomacy as the use of digital media in the field of diplomacy and how countries are utilizing these tools in the pursuit of their foreign policies²⁰. To Potter, digital diplomacy mainly refers to diplomatic practices through digital and networked technologies, including the Internet, mobile devices, and social media channels²¹.

Digital diplomacy, although not different from public diplomacy, has specific instruments. Digital diplomacy is utilizing the digital platform to enhance mutual understanding and communication between the governing and foreign public, rather than the one-way propagation of ideas and values²². Further, the author argues that in digital diplomacy,

17 Hamad Al-Muftah et al., "Factors Influencing E-Diplomacy Implementation: Exploring Causal Relationships Using Interpretive Structural Modelling," *Government information quarterly* 35, no. 3 (2018): 502–514.

18 André Barrinha and Thomas Renard, "Cyber-Diplomacy: The Making of an International Society in the Digital Age," *Global Affairs* 3, no. 4-5 (October 20, 2017): 353–364.

19 Ludiro Madu, "Indonesia's Digital Diplomacy: Problems and Challenges," *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional* 7, no. 1 (September 21, 2018): 11–18, accessed October 21, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.71121>.

20 Adesina, "Foreign Policy in an Era of Digital Diplomacy."

21 Evan H Potter, *Cyber-Diplomacy - Managing Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002).

22 Leif-Eric Easley and Kyuri Park, "South Korea's Mismatched Diplomacy in Asia: Middle Power Identity, Interests, and Foreign Policy," *International politics* (Hague, Netherlands) 55, no. 2 (2018): 242–263.

a government directly targets the public. So the communication would be government to people or people to people. As part of public diplomacy, it aims to the public, not just the government as the primary target in diplomacy. Thus, digital diplomacy can be defined as public diplomacy that targets the public, or government to public communication using digital media whether social media, the internet or any other digital media to achieve state national interest or foreign policy goals and to deliver nation branding to the public such as local values, history, culture, and others.

Digital diplomacy uses more specifically into social media. According to Manor and Segev²³, digital diplomacy refers mainly to the growing use of social media platforms by a country in order to achieve its foreign policy goals and proactively manage its image and reputation. This definition is the same as Pamment's definition of digital diplomacy as the use of digital tools of communication (social media) by diplomats to communicate with each other and with the general public²⁴. They noted that digital diplomacy exists at two levels: that of the foreign ministry and that of embassies located around the world. By operating on these two levels, nations can tailor foreign policy and nation-branding messages to the unique characteristics of local audiences concerning history, culture, values, and traditions, thereby facilitating the acceptance of their foreign policy and the image they aim to promote²⁵.

Digital diplomacy is identical to social media diplomacy. First, to measure the

efficiency of digital diplomacy, social media is utilized. It can count the digital expansion of the audiences globally. It reaches many people rapidly and easily becomes a trend. Social media can provide the number of people who have seen the postings, the origin the ways of interactions. As it has been said before, digital diplomacy aims to the public, to see if the public gets the information, social media can be used. Bjola and Jiang examine the efficiency of social media in public diplomacy²⁶. Second, as part of public diplomacy, digital diplomacy also aims to gather information from the public then it will be accumulated and formulated to be foreign policy. Recently, the public shares their opinions, feelings, political affiliations, via social media. As a result, a foreign ministry can be more natural to gather opinions from the public about their image via social media as their digital diplomacy tool than in traditional diplomacy.

There is still debate among diplomacy practitioners and scholars about social media in diplomacy, which media would be the best in performing or supporting digital diplomacy. Recently, a number of ministries of foreign affairs use Facebook, Twitter, and other social media. Twitter has been said as an effective media in public diplomacy²⁷. However, Easley and Park claimed that this kind of media only brings one way of communication²⁸. It only delivers information from the government but has obstacles in obtaining public opinion in a more sophisticated form. Twitter has limit on characters, allowing only 144 characters per tweet. It will cause difficulty in communicating effectively with brevity. Our tweet can be missed if we post it while not many followers

23 Ilan Manor and Elad Segev, "America's Selfie: How the US Portrays Itself on Its Social Media Accounts," in *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice.*, Corneliu B. (London - New York: routledge, 2015), 89-108.

24 James Pamment, "Digital Diplomacy as Transmedia Engagement: Aligning Theories of Participatory Culture with International Advocacy Campaigns," *New Media & Society* 18, no. 9 (2016): 2046-2062.

25 Adesina, "Foreign Policy in an Era of Digital Diplomacy."

26 Manor and Segev, "America's Selfie: How the US Portrays Itself on Its Social Media Accounts."

27 Meghan Sobel, Daniel Riffe, and Joe Bob Hester, "Twitter Diplomacy? A Content Analysis of Eight US Embassies' Twitter Feeds," *The Journal of Social Media in Society* 5, no. 2 (2016): 75-107.

28 Easley and Park, "South Korea's Mismatched Diplomacy in Asia: Middle Power Identity, Interests, and Foreign Policy."

online. Therefore, as the objective of public diplomacy is to gather information from the public too, this media has a weakness. Facebook is the most popular social media used by people recently²⁹. Doing digital diplomacy on Facebook also could be beneficial as it can gain many people at once. It has pictures, videos, and other features to accommodate the posting. Facebook is more interactive than other social media. However, there is no single social media without any weakness in supporting digital diplomacy. Every social media has weaknesses and strengths. Thus, no wonder foreign ministries not only uses one social media platform but many. As it can gain a high number of public engagement, it will deliver two ways communication and more public to be engaged.

Apart from using digital media, it purposes to public, although digital diplomacy can utilize any digital media, its aims also to achieve national interests, digital diplomacy cannot replace traditional diplomacy practices³⁰. Some practices in traditional diplomacy cannot be replaced by digital diplomacy practices. As a result, digital diplomacy cannot dominate over traditional diplomacy. Traditional diplomacy, mostly known as government-to-government relations, is a one-way communication. Digital diplomacy is different. It aims for the government to people relations or strengthens people-to-people relations. Digital diplomacy is a complement to traditional diplomacy. Negotiation, mediation, state-to-state meeting is possible to be conducted via digital media such as via teleconference. High-speed internet, high-resolution cameras, and other sophisticated instrument in

telecommunication can support the meeting. Thus, distance is no longer an issue in digital diplomacy while communicating with other parties or act like traditional diplomacy. However, people in teleconference are usually less attached and hard to maintain eye contact. It is challenging to interpret body language and gestures during the teleconference. A study conducted by Wainfan and Davis concludes that participants in teleconferences may have difficulty to identify remote speakers, detecting movements, and gaining floor control³¹. As a result, the party negotiating in teleconferences could feel less respect for each other that could be because of less eye contact, less social engagement, and others. Another issue is cyber security, third parties could espionage during teleconference meetings, miss interpretation and spread immature news to the public. Thus, digital diplomacy is an inefficient tools for government to government relations or communication, especially for essential agendas.

There are some objectives of digital diplomacy inline public diplomacy. First, digital diplomacy acts as the delivery of official information. Digital diplomacy aims to inform and engage with society in the host country of an embassy³². By managing social media, the bureau of public affairs can deliver messages regarding their government policy. Therefore, the message will be more accurate. For example, the bureau can clarify misleading and misinformation in media concerning their country in social media without doing a press conference for minor misleading information. The bureau of public affairs' social media can inform many things, such as new policy

29 Andrew Anderson and Monica Perrin, "Share of U.S. Adults Using Social Media, Including Facebook, Is Mostly Unchanged since 2018," *Pew Research Center*, April 10, 2019, accessed August 10, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org>.

30 Sabrina Sotiriu, "Digital Diplomacy Between Promises and Reality," in *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice.*, ed. Corneliu Bjola and Marcus Holmes (Routledge, 2015): 19.

31 Lynne Wainfan, *Challenges in Virtual Collaboration Videoconferencing, Audioconferencing, and Computer-Mediated Communications* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 2004).

32 Kullniar Ewa and Filimoniuk Nataliia, "E-Diplomacy on Twitter. International Comparison of Strategies and Effectivity," *Social Communication* 3, no. 2 (2017): 34-41, <https://doaj.org/article/4d32b0b08d9b4857b690c80f8eaf46c9>.

planning, disaster information, national objectives, and others. Besides, having an official social media account could expand the ministry of foreign affairs' engagement with people in a targeted country as recently, many people use social media. Esser said that social media offers us a way to do that in real-time with a much broader reach than we could ever hope for with traditional public diplomacy³³.

Second, Adesina explains that social media also could act as consular communication and responses³⁴. Through social media channels, an embassy can inform its services such as application to obtain a visa, or answer people's questions regarding consular service without people having to phone the office. Moreover, from comments or feedback that has been written before, people with the same problems can read it on social media without asking the same question again.

Third, social media in digital diplomacy acts like promotion media in public diplomacy³⁵. Official social media of an embassy can promote several locations, events, or other activities in the home country to attract tourism to visit. It also can inform traditional cultures and tribes it has to promote indigenous society it has. Further, it also can inform their national branding to strengthen their image to be more well known by people.

Fourth, it aims to engage with the public and expand the network. Social media could act as listening tools. It can accommodate people's recommendations, complaints and requests, or what kind of information people would like to find about the country from its official social media. Talking about

engagement, through social media an embassy can deliver messages regarding special events or special issues happening in the host country. It can be seen that the embassy and its country care and know about what happened in the host country and would like to be part of the society in the host country.

There are three indicators which can be used to assess whether social media is a useful tool in digital diplomacy and able to gain objectives in digital diplomacy. Bjola and Jiang have also used these indicators in analyzing several countries practicing in digital diplomacy³⁶. First, agenda-setting, according to Macdermott agenda-setting defines as the "ability of new media to influence the salience of topics on public agenda"³⁷. Agenda setting is related to information dissemination. Further, agenda-setting aims to analyze to what extent social media platforms enable diplomats to set the agenda and discuss it with their targeted foreign public. It also means that social media acts as an information platform. Therefore, if there is any foreign policy that would like to be implemented by a state, it supposed to be sounded in all of the social media platforms it has. In this case, Taiwan and the New Southbound Policy, this paper would like to assess whether the New Southbound Policy is mentioned or not in Taiwan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs social media platform. If it is mentioned, it means Taiwan's digital diplomacy does agenda setting in its social media.

The second indicator is presence expansion. Presence expansion means engagement and presence with the issue of targeted countries. For example, its social media mentions and informs the public about what happens in the target country, engage with the public

33 Victoria Esser, "21st Century Statecraft: Forging U.S. Digital Diplomacy," *Huffpost*, last modified March 27, 2012, accessed October 21, 2019, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/us-diplomacy-technology_b_1223638.

34 Adesina, "Foreign Policy in an Era of Digital Diplomacy."

35 Rashica Viona, "The Benefits and Risks of Digital Diplomacy," *SEEU Review* 13, no. 1 (2018): 75-89, <https://doaj.org/article/35f26bf19e2140f1ab75727d2c9dd849>.

36 Manor and Segev, "America's Selfie: How the US Portrays Itself on Its Social Media Accounts."

37 Siobhan Macdermott, "Diplomacy: An Open-Source Alternative," *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* 39, no. 1 (2015): 99-104, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1682906635/>.

with their country issue and so on. The third indicator is conversation generating. Digital diplomacy in social media does not only mean posting to inform the public but also making conversation with the public, and interacting with them. It means that this indicator will look at whether the social media response to what people mention in their social media and do interact with them. This study examines the efficiency of digital diplomacy in social media, using these three indicators combined with digital diplomacy aims, at the end, it assesses the efficiency of digital diplomacy of Taiwan in supporting its the New Southbound Policy.

Methods

This paper analyzes several official social media platforms utilized by Taiwan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) which are Facebook and twitter. This research will do a content analysis of the New Southbound Policy, tracing posts related to the policy; how many posts, and how engaged Taiwan's MOFA is with the foreign policy content. To assist with the content analysis, Nvivo will be utilized. Using this software, it will count how many New Southbound Policy posts appear on Taiwan's MOFA social media. However, as digital diplomacy is not only about social media, other digital platforms used by MOFA will also be assessed regarding their contribution in promoting New Southbound Policy.

Specifically, there are several media as primary sources that have been assessed in this research. First, Taiwan's MOFA official Facebook fan page (@mofa.gov.tw) and Twitter (MOFA_Taiwan) and Taiwan Economic and Trade Office in Indonesia's Facebook fan page (@TETOinindonesia), and to support the promotion of the New Southbound Policy Twitter and Facebook account from President Tsai Ing Wen (@iingwen) also will be assessed. In addition, it will assess those media content

or posts from January 2017. This timeline was chosen because the New Southbound Policy was officially launched in September 2016. Therefore, it is assumed that since January 2017, Taiwan Government's official social media have been familiarized with the policy.

First, it captures all of the posts from social media mentioned above. Second, it will select how many posts mentioned the New Southbound Policy per account and its interaction such as the number of likes, shares, comments, tweets and retweets. Then, it counts how many posts per account has the New Southbound Policy pillars, for example, promoting Taiwan's tourism, culture, people exchange in the context of Southeast Asia especially Indonesia. Particular keywords are used to collect data such as Indonesia, the New Southbound Policy, tourism, and others.

Results and Discussion

First, let us talk the nature of social media accounts used by Taiwan's MOFA and Taiwan's President Tsai Ing-Wen as digital diplomacy tools. There are several social media used by MOFA in digital platforms. However, Facebook and Twitter are the most popular media. MOFA also has YouTube account and Instagram, however, the subscribers and followers are not as many as Facebook and Twitter accounts. Another digital diplomacy tool used by MOFA is the Line application. So far, not many embassies or ministries of foreign affairs use this application in their digital diplomacy. There is no wonder that Line is being used by MOFA, as it famous among Taiwanese.

President Tsai Ing-Wen Facebook page has the highest number of followers. This account has 2,457,116 people like and there are 2,471,349 followers in this account. As the highest number of followers, this account is also the oldest created. It has been created since 2008. President Tsai Ing-wen's Twitter

account also has a high number of followers which is 515.600 followers. It can be assumed that the president's account is a useful tool in digital diplomacy. It can attract numerous people easily. Taiwan MOFA's Facebook and Twitter are in the second place. They have 85,261 likes and 89,682 followers. The Facebook fan page has a higher number than the Twitter account. The Twitter account only has 62.500 followers. Meanwhile, TETO in Jakarta's Facebook fan page has the smallest number of followers compared with the president's and Taiwan MOFA's social media accounts. TETO in Jakarta's Facebook fan page has 4,682 likes and 4,997 followers. However, TETO in Indonesia does not have Twitter, Instagram and YouTube as mentioned on its website. In addition, Taiwan MOFA YouTube account has 4.700 subscribers.

In terms of posting, all of those accounts mentioned above usually post two to three postings per day. Every posting has different number of likes, comments, and shares. Another point to be noted is that the accounts are responsive. Accounts administrators reply and interact with people in the comment room and answer questions that they are capable of answering and giving more precise information in the comment room. Those social media accounts used by Taiwan government, especially Taiwan's MOFA, are engaging with people. They do not only achieve a high number of people engagement or followers, but they also maintain it by posting regularly. Therefore, people who follow will always keep updating with those accounts.

In terms of keywords, as this research aims to look at utilizing of social media in digital diplomacy and how Taiwan digital diplomacy run especially from governments social media, from its analysis, it found that the New Southbound Policy only mentioned around 25 times or has 25 posts from Taiwan MOFA Facebook fan page account, 22 posts from its

Twitter. Meanwhile, there were 12 posts on the President Tsai Ing-wen Twitter account about the New Southbound Policy. However, only 1 post from the president's Facebook that posted in March 2019 from 2019-2018. Also, a small number mentioned of the New Southbound Policy on TETO Indonesia Facebook fan page, this account only had two posts since its creation date.

If we search "Indonesia" in those social media, except TETO in Indonesia's account, it is only mentioned 3-10 times from the timeline in those social media accounts. It can be said that Taiwan's digital diplomacy from its social media instrument does not promote the policy quite well. Having said that, those social media platforms do not campaign the policy as the name but mention it couple of times.

Discussion

Although those social media accounts do not mention the New Southbound Policy, they posted something that would like to address the policy. There is a high number of posts that promote the policy and the objectives. For example, resource sharing as one of the policy objectives like promoting tourism, culture, technology, and others belongs to Taiwan. TETO in Jakarta's Facebook fan page is the most media mentioning it. Delivery in Indonesia or sometimes in English, this social media mentions a lot about Taiwan tourism, mainly what tourism objects should be visited while in Taiwan, any event that is held on the particular session, and others. From 364 posts from January 2019 until August 2019, this media posts about 58 posts about Taiwan tourism. Tourism is also the most frequent post mentioned in other Taiwan government officials' social media. Other media platforms also mention about what happens in the New Southbound Policy framework. For example, there is a consular service, free visa

exemption, a new online method to apply for a working visa for Indonesia, and so forth.

To sum up, Taiwan government official social media do not mention often the New Southbound Policy but actively posts about its policy objectives such as people-to-people, resource sharing and others. Tourism under the resource sharing objective is the most common post on the social media to promote the New Southbound Policy followed by people-to-people exchange indicated by posts about Taiwan scholarship, studying Mandarin in Taiwan, fellowship, industry and professional exchange, and so on. Mostly this objective in Indonesia performed by TETO in Indonesia. In other words, this media is quite effective to inform people about the objective of the New Southbound Policy, without mentioning the policy name.

Digital diplomacy is also about people engagement and how to communicate with people or government-to-people relations and or people-to-people relations. Digital diplomacy tools also has to enable people to communicate with the government, so not only the government who can inform the public about the policy and what it will do. In Taiwan government's social media, the New Southbound Policy do not have many likes and shares on Facebook and Twitter. It can be said that it does not engage with people. Those social media inform many people or at least their followers, indicating by high number of likes, love, and shares among people for every post. From the data, it can be found that at minimum there are ten likes per posts from Taiwan MOFA social media and a higher number than that for the president's accounts. However, for TETO in Jakarta, it has less number. Contrarily, the New Southbound Policy posts or news also do not have many likes or shares, but it is viewed by many followers.

There are four major pillars objective of

the New Southbound Policy; resource sharing is the most objective promoted in social media, especially tourism it mostly posted by TETO in Jakarta. This account also posts Taiwan culture and Indonesian culture. People-to-people exchange are in the second place to be promoted in social media. All of social media account posted it. However, a high number of posts mentioned about it is done by the president's account. Regional link whether bilateral collaboration or multilateral collaboration is primarily posted by MOFA social media and President Tsai Ing-wen, like meeting with state leaders in Southeast Asia, collaboration in certain theme like agriculture, infrastructure projects and others.

However, if we compare for overall posts on the social media accounts, new southbound policy does not have big portion. Most of posts in Taiwan's government social media are about its interaction in global or multilateral. For example slogan "Taiwan Can Help", or Taiwan's role in WHA is bigger than the New Southbound Policy. Taiwan's role in global medicine or medical care also have more significant portion than the New Southbound Policy. That action sometimes can be counted as part of promotion of the New Southbound Policy, if it collaborates or works with countries listed as the New Southbound Policy partners. However it does not occurs like that.

If we analyze digital diplomacy objectives (delivery of official information, consular communication, promotion, engaging and expanding network) and its efficiency (agenda-setting, preserve expansion, and conservation generating) all of the social media accounts fulfill those objectives and efficiency indicators. Especially TETO in Indonesia, it posts information about what happened in Taiwan and Indonesia, especially issue that happened in these countries. This fan page also posts about consular services, for example posting about visa requirements for

migrant workers. It also delivers news about disasters such as typhoons and earthquakes in Taiwan and Indonesia. It does promote Taiwan's multilateral policy such as "Taiwan Can Help", promote its culture, aboriginal culture, tourism, and others. However talking about expanding network, it expands to target the public audience. It can be seen from the number of people shares and likes which is high. However, in terms of people engagement, it is quite low not many people engage with it by giving comments, ask something or deliver their opinion and recommendation but the admin keeps updating and if there is any question in comment they do reply it.

Talking about efficiency. It does agenda-setting by delivery or mentions several times about the New Southbound Policy. It does many posts about the New Southbound Policy objectives such as multilateral cooperation, people-to-people exchange and most commonly resource sharing. It means that those media do agenda-setting digital diplomacy. Preserve expansion is also being done by those media by promoting and engaging with people in the targeted countries. In addition, it supports the delivery of news in the targeted country. However, those social media do not doing well in engaging and expanding network, not many comments and people asking about the New Southbound Policy. Usually on those accounts, there is a limited number of likes or comments from followers. Sometimes, even though there are comments it only appears emoticon from followers from people. Indicating they like it or not. However, compared to other posts or policy, many comments and tweets are there. It means Taiwan digital diplomacy in social media commonly do one-way information from government and many people know it by giving many likes and love, but people do not give a high number of feedback in comment. Besides, the New Southbound Policy is not favorite topic there.

Another interesting point about Taiwan digital diplomacy is, this country does not employ Facebook and Twitter as digital diplomacy instruments. It has website such the New Southbound Policy website, which also has exclusive feature other information about the New Southbound Policy can be found in executive yuan, bureau of foreign trade and another government websites. Therefore, if people want to know in-depth or general information about this policy they can easily access it from many government channels. Taiwan also has Line app and Migration App as unique digital diplomacy instruments that does not employed by other states, especially Line. However Taiwan provides it.

To sum up, social media helps Taiwan promote its New Southbound Policy and fulfill digital diplomacy objectives. In government sector, Taiwan has many instruments in digital diplomacy ranging from news, website, social media, Line and conversation tools, to app for accessing its tourism and migration information. Resource sharing is the most common feature that can be found in Taiwan social media as part of its digital diplomacy in new southbound policy framework followed by people-to-people exchanges. However this policy is not as famous as other policies in their official social media. Comprehensively, if we combine, Taiwan digital diplomacy platforms fulfill certain role. The website, for instance, provides information of what people should know about the New Southbound Policy. Social media enables people to interact and update daily on what is happening in Taiwan and the targeted countries, including the progress of the policy in more unexpected ways. Another application such as Line and android applications enables the government to interact with people, while people also can deliver question more privately and get further information.

Conclusion

Taiwan's digital diplomacy helps to promote its foreign policy; the New Southbound Policy. This policy has been mentioned several times in Taiwan's MOFA official social media platforms. Resource sharing and people-to-people exchange are the most posts found in its social media. We said that the most promoting feature from the new southbound policy. TETO in Indonesia's social media, especially, actively promotes tourism and Taiwan's cuisine.

However, in terms of people engagement, Taiwan's digital diplomacy through its social media does not engage actively with people especially in Indonesia. There seems only one-way communication; not many people interact with the New Southbound Policy posts. Therefore, it could be assumed that not many Indonesians know and understand what is Taiwan's new southbound policy although the policy gives positive feedback to Taiwan.

Digital diplomacy practitioners need to optimize digital media in doing digital diplomacy that does not only lean on social media but also other media platforms. Digital diplomacy aims for public diplomacy to engage with the public, create national branding and others, therefore, to optimize it, gain as much information from the public and provide much information in media is needed. Further research needs to be conducted to analyze other media used in digital diplomacy and combine it with social media. It will show comprehensively whether a state utilizes any platform in digital media to perform its digital diplomacy. Other things need to be done is people's perspective and opinion in the host country about the image of the country doing digital diplomacy. It will calculate whether the aim of digital diplomacy to people is achieved or not.

As this research limits its assessment to government efforts in digital diplomacy, further research needs to do more in-depth

analyses on how private sectors like industry, business, and Taiwanese help to promote the New Southbound Policy in digital media. We need further information on what other media platforms are being used by those private sectors and it can compare with the government to show which one is the most effective way in doing digital diplomacy, concern on government or private or could be a combination of both.

REFERENCES

- Adesina, Olubukola S. "Foreign Policy in an Era of Digital Diplomacy." *Cogent social sciences* 3, no. 1 (2017). <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/23311886.2017.1297175>.
- Al-Muftah, Hamad, Vishanth Weerakkody, Nripendra P Rana, Uthayasankar Sivarajah, and Zahir Irani. "Factors Influencing E-Diplomacy Implementation: Exploring Causal Relationships Using Interpretive Structural Modelling." *Government information quarterly* 35, no. 3 (2018): 502–514.
- Anderson, Andrew, and Monica Perrin. "Share of U.S. Adults Using Social Media, Including Facebook, Is Mostly Unchanged since 2018." *Pew Research Center*, April 10, 2019. Accessed August 10, 2019. <https://www.pewresearch.org>.
- Barrinha, André, and Thomas Renard. "Cyber-Diplomacy: The Making of an International Society in the Digital Age." *Global Affairs* 3, no. 4–5 (October 20, 2017): 353–364.
- Bull, H, A Hurrell, and S Hoffman. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Bureau of Foreign Trade. "New southbound policy Implementation Plans." Last modified 2016. Accessed April 4, 2018. <https://newsouthboundpolicy.trade.gov.tw/English/PageDetail?pageID=50&nodeID=94>.
- Cull, Nicholas J. "Public Diplomacy: Seven Lessons for Its Future from Its Past." *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 6, no. 1 (February 16, 2010): 11–17.
- Cull, Nicholas J. "The Long Road to Public Diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US Public Diplomacy." *International Studies Review* 15, no. 1 (2013): 123–139.
- Easley, Leif-Eric, and Kyuri Park. "South Korea's Mismatched Diplomacy in Asia: Middle Power Identity, Interests, and Foreign Policy." *International politics* (Hague, Netherlands) 55, no. 2 (2018): 242–263.
- Esser, Victoria. "21st Century Statecraft: Forging U.S. Digital Diplomacy." *Huffpost*. Last modified March 27, 2012. Accessed October 21, 2019. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/us-diplomacy-technology_b_1223638.
- Ewa, Kullniar, and Filimoniuk Nataliia. "E-Diplomacy on Twitter. International Comparison of Strategies and Effectivity." *Social Communication* 3, no. 2 (2017): 34–41. <https://doaj.org/article/4d32b0b08d9b4857b690c80f8eaf46c9>.
- Glaser, Bonnie, Scott Kennedy, Derek Mitchell, and Matthew Funaiolo. *The New southbound policy: Deepening Taiwan's Regional Integration*. Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2018.
- Huang, Kwei-Bo. "Taiwan 'S New southbound policy: Background, Objectives, Framework And Limits." *Revista UNISCI*, no. 46 (2018): 47–68. <https://doaj.org/article/d5d65a3334364617b3193db207c57f77>.
- Karadag, Haluk. "Forcing the Common Good: The Significance of Public Diplomacy in Military Affairs." *Armed Forces & Society* 43, no. 1 (2017): 72–91.
- Leonard, Mark. "Diplomacy by Other Means." *Foreign Policy*, no. 132 (2002): 48–56.
- Macdermott, Siobhan. "Diplomacy: An Open-Source Alternative." *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* 39, no. 1 (2015): 99–104. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1682906635/>.

- Madu, Ludiro. "Indonesia's Digital Diplomacy: Problems and Challenges." *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional* 7, no. 1 (September 21, 2018): 11–18. Accessed October 21, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.71121>.
- Manor, Ilan, and Elad Segev. "America's Selfie: How the US Portrays Itself on Its Social Media Accounts." In *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice.*, 89–108. Corneliu B. London - New York: routledge, 2015.
- Melissen, J. "The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations." *Choice Reviews Online* 44, no. 03. *Studies in Diplomacy and International Relations* (2006): 44-1781-44-1781.
- Melissen Jan, Dr. *The New Public Diplomacy : Soft Power in International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Pamment, James. "Digital Diplomacy as Transmedia Engagement: Aligning Theories of Participatory Culture with International Advocacy Campaigns." *New Media & Society* 18, no. 9 (2016): 2046–2062.
- Potter, Evan H. *Cyber-Diplomacy - Managing Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.
- Rana, Kishan S. *21st Century Diplomacy : A Practitioner's Guide. 21st Century Diplomacy : A Practitioner's Guide*, 2011.
- Sherry Lee Mueller. "The Nexus of U.S. Public Diplomacy and Citizen Diplomacy." In *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, edited by Nancy Snow and Nicholas John Cull. Routledge, 2020.
- Sobel, Meghan, Daniel Riffe, and Joe Bob Hester. "Twitter Diplomacy? A Content Analysis of Eight US Embassies' Twitter Feeds." *The Journal of Social Media in Society* 5, no. 2 (2016): 75–107.
- Sotiriu, Sabrina. "Digital Diplomacy Between Promises and Reality." In *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice.*, edited by Corneliu Bjola and Marcus Holmes, 19. Routledge, 2015.
- Tuch, Hans N. *Communicating with the World U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas*, 1990.
- Viona, Rashica. "The Benefits and Risks of Digital Diplomacy." *SEEU Review* 13, no. 1 (2018): 75–89. <https://doaj.org/article/35f26bf19e2140f1ab75727d2c9dd849>.
- Wainfan, Lynne. *Challenges in Virtual Collaboration Videoconferencing, Audioconferencing, and Computer-Mediated Communications*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 2004.