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Abstract

Important political conversations in Kenya have taken place on the Twitter micro-blogging social media platform. In 2013, a ‘digital’ government led by Kenya’s President Uhuru Kenyatta and Deputy President William Ruto embraced Twitter as a medium of communication. This study is an empirical assessment of the nature of Twitter’s use in government communication by all the members of Kenya’s National Executive (NE) who include: The President, his Deputy, Cabinet Secretaries and the Attorney-General, from July 2016, when the government year began, to September 2016. The aim of this study was to analyze the extent to which Kenya’s National Executive Leaders (NELs) were using Twitter in their daily work, interacting with online audiences and applying dialogic content strategies in their Twitter profiles to establish and enhance relations with their online followers and citizens. An interaction analysis found that majority of the National Executive Leaders had low interactions with their followers at 66.7 per cent, while only 1.9 per cent of the understudy had highest interactions with their followers, 14.7 per cent had average interactions, 13 per cent had high interactions while 3.7 per cent had the lowest interactions.

Leaders used the Twitter platform to broadcast formal information as the study found that 87.5 per cent of the broadcast information related to government activities while 12.5 per cent published content unrelated to government activities. Of the three dialogic principles investigated, only usefulness of information was significant, while both dialogic loop and the generation of return visits were absent indicating a more content-focus as opposed to engagement with followers. The findings show that the situation on the use of Twitter for governance needs to improve. Further research should focus on how the leaders are using other social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, blogs, and YouTube for effective governance.

Keywords: Twitter Utilization, National Executive Leaders, Twitter, Social Media Networks, Social Media Strategies, Dialogic Communications, Governance
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Social media has in the recent past become a major force to reckon with in all areas of communications and this has changed the way communication is handled on all fronts including social, economic or political spheres. Government communication has also leveraged the influence of social media where both politicians and citizens integrate it into their communication.

According to Segado-Boj, Diaz-Campo, and Lloves-Sobrado (2015), the successful use of the social media by Barack Obama in the 2008 presidential election to connect with voters, mobilize volunteers and amass a huge campaign war chest and his reliance on the internet, especially social network sites, was thought to have been critical to his victory.

The use of media among leaders to inform and influence citizens is not a new phenomenon. In fact, this practice can be traced back in history (Ssozi, 2016). Over the years, however, it has taken various forms, which have been influenced by changes in the media landscape. For instance, Ssozi (2016) posits that the advent of new media tools, which gave the microphone over to the citizens has been perceived as a way to boost participation between government and its citizens. Therefore, today, these new media tools such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and YouTube, have given ordinary citizens a platform to communicate to the world and to their leaders directly (Ssozi, 2016). Panagiotopoulos and Sam (2012) argue that Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter are among the most popular social networking platforms, also referred to as web 2.0.

In Kenya, social media platforms have gained acceptance as a medium of communications both at work and as part of social life (Ssozi, 2016). While opening Facebook offices in South Africa, the firm revealed that there were 4.5 million active
monthly users in Kenya (Adday, 2015). This growth, adoption, and acceptance of social networking platforms were propelled by a growing youthful population (Authority, 2016). In a country with over 45 million people, 79 per cent of the population is said to be under 35 years of age (Douai & Olorunisola, 2013). Douai and Olorunisola (2013) posit that as digital technologies continue to traverse all aspects of contemporary life, citizens are adopting new tools to enable them to exercise their rights; access information at their convinience and perform their civic duties.

A study investigating the relationship between youth engagement on social media and their interest in politics, found out that Facebook is an important source of political information and news (Schreiner, 2015). In Kenya, Facebook has replaced traditional media, such as television, radio and newspapers as a source of news among the youths (Schreiner, 2015). Young Kenyans use Facebook to express themselves and to debate political issues such as employment, youth empowerment and social services. Forty-seven 47 per cent of young people using Facebook have already talked to a politician through a social network. Besides, youth who are active on social media were found to be more interested in politics and more willing to vote in the next election than those not using social media (Douai & Olorunisola, 2013).

In addition, one cannot ignore the fact that fast strong internet penetration has heralded the adoption and acceptance of social networking platforms. Data aggregated from Miniwatts Marketing Group (2017) and published by the Daily Nation shows that Kenya leads Africa in internet penetration at 70 per cent. Additionally, 7 out of 10 Kenyans are using the internet (Otieno, 2016). This same author also notes that the increased growth in internet use has been catapulted by affordable mobile phones in the market, cheaper internet bundles offered by mobile operators, and improved connectivity from fiber optic cables. He further asserts that the majority of Kenyans access the internet through their mobile phones.
This fact is supported in Higgins’ (2015) study which observed that Kenya’s mobile phone penetration rates stood at 80 per cent and that almost every man and woman on the street had a phone and this tool was changing lives.

Moreover, to gain an understanding of the role of digital media in Africa, there is a need to look at Twitter as a communication tool. Twitter was founded in 2006, by Jack Dorsey, Evans William, Biz Stone and Noah Glass. Worldwide, there are a lot of studies about Twitter, but the most captivating observation is that Twitter Inc co-founder Evans William sent his first tweet from Kenya in 2007 (L.P, 2014). Globally, Twitter has over 1.3 billion registered users and 313 million active users monthly (Frier, 2016). Although, Twitter itself has not released any official data on how many active users it has, data provided and released by a communication firm, Portland Communications, ranked Kenya fourth in Africa among the countries that the tweeted most with 76 million geolocated tweets (Agutu, 2016).

Tomaselli and Sundar (2011) revealed that Twitter users in Africa are using the medium to keep themselves informed on national issues. Therefore, Twitter is no longer a western or frivolous phenomenon (Tomaselli & Sundar, 2011). It is clear that Africans are using it, and it would be foolish to miss an opportunity of reaching citizens through it (Tomaselli & Sundar, 2011). This study focuses on Twitter, which is a type of social networking platform. Twitter is extensively used for social conversations, with 81 per cent of African users using it to converse with friends (Tomaselli & Sundar, 2011). This shows that social media cannot be neglected as an important channel for young people and has helped get them more interested and involved in politics, leadership and governance (Adegoke, 2016). Simon, Goldberg, Aharonson-Daniel, Leykin, and Adini, (2014) asserts that Twitter is highly used in Kenya and thus serves as a popular platform for sharing information.

Globally, governments, ministers, elected leaders and political elite have come to appreciate the role of social media tools, while at the same time embracing them as either
broadcast or conversation platforms (Waters & Williams, 2011). For instance, a 2016 study by Twiplomacy revealed that about 80 per cent of African leaders were on Twitter although some were neither active nor well-connected to their counterparts. The study further revealed that ‘Africa is home to some of the most conversational leaders on Twitter’ (Twiplomacy, 2016). Kenyan President Uhuru Kenyatta and his Rwandan President Paul Kagame, were ranked among the top 50 of the most followed and active world leaders on Twitter. Arguably, Twitter has not only become a popular communication tool but also important to their political and personal lives (Ssozi, 2016). There is no doubt that the trend of African presidents on Twitter is an indication that the platform is being used as a participatory tool, since it offers two-way real-time interaction and engagement. In Africa, any government that embraces social media in its communication is considered as innovative government (Panagiotopoulos & Sam, 2012).

Therefore, it can be argued that the presence of the presidents on Twitter gives citizens a chance to engage them in political debate (Ssozi, 2016). It is also important to note that in countries like Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda, where the presidents are active on Twitter, other public institutions have followed suit and are engaging Citizens on service delivery (Ssozi, 2016). If these institutions are emulating the presidents, then there is a critical need to capture and analyze what the political elites and minister are using Twitter for. Hence, this research explored the tweets of National Executive Leaders (NELs) – President, Deputy President, Attorney-General and all Cabinet Secretaries- to establish their Twitter presence, to understand what they tweet about, and how they interact with their followers. The study aim is to understand if the National Executive Leaders were using Twitter as a broadcast or conversational tool. By adopting Kent and Taylor (1998) dialogic communications framework principles, the study sought to discover if the National Executive Leaders use Twitter to communicate about government-related or non-government related activities.
To complete this investigation, the study applied Kent and Taylor’s (1998) Dialogic Communication Principles. These principles are: Dialogic Loop, Usefulness of Information and Generation of Return Visits. The study not only focused on discursive practices of the National Executive Leaders, but also keenly observed and referred to the discourses surrounding the understudy in order to gain critical insights on these principles on government communications.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The application of dialogic principles in social networks is still underutilized. The study uses Kent and Taylor’s (1998) dialogic principles: usefulness of information, the return of visits, and dialogic loop to establish the extent to which the National Executive Leaders in Kenya are using Twitter as a communications platform.

Today, the internet evolution in the country has encouraged Kenyans to embrace social media platforms as communication channels. Social media platforms such as Twitter have become an important element in the lives of individuals of all ages. In particular, the young generation consumes news and interacts with friends and peers via Twitter (Adegoke, 2016). Therefore, Twitter has become an indispensable communication platform for them. The platform has given the young Kenyan, who forms 65 per cent of the total population, a voice to be heard and as well as self-validation (Adegoke, 2016). Twitter has become a popular meeting place, particularly for young urban Kenyans, in part because the exchange of short text and image-based tweets is suited for those using mobile phones to access the Internet.

A recent study, showed that Kenya is the second most active nation on Twitter in Africa, after South Africa and that Kenya’s President is the most followed leader on Twitter in Sub-Saharan Africa with 1.4 million followers (Simon et al, 2014). According to a 21 November, 2011 article published on Forbes.com, Uhuru Kenyatta is noted to have leveraged
the power of social media to reach the young Kenyan electorate. Today, the President’s Twitter account has transformed from a political campaign platform to a government communication medium (Ssozi, 2016). This was evident when the President appointed blogger Denis Itumbi as Director Digital, New Media and Diaspora in the Executive Office of The President (EOP). The President uses the platform regularly to inform the public about key activities related to his office, to ensure that Kenyans are informed about his activities (Ssozi, 2016).

His use of Twitter has opened a new form of communication by government officials. Simon et.al, (2014) reported that during the Westgate Mall Attack government officials communicated from the scene by providing eyewitness accounts, by leveraging Twitter. By doing so, the government officials’ messages were perceived as a credible source of information (Simon et.al, 2014). There is a widespread acknowledgement of the potential benefits of social media platforms by individuals (celebrities, politicians and sportsmen/women), businesses and institutions (Kigumo, 2016).

The study sought to make an empirical and methodological contribution to the emerging questions by presenting an overview study of Twitter by Kenya’s National Executive Leaders. The exploratory research leveraged the online research tool (Twitonomy) to capture a large dataset of Twitter data from the official accounts of 23 National Executive Leaders.

The study’s findings are useful in advising the current government on how to improve its engagement with citizens, after an analysis done using the dialogic loop principle. The study contributes to knowledge and insights on the role of Twitter in government communication at a time when newspaper readership is declining (Otieno, 2016). This was achieved after running an analysis on tweets from Kenya’s NELs using the usefulness of information principle and the generation of return visits. This was the first time
in Kenya’s history that appointed government officials were on Twitter and the first Kenyan President is sharing government information on Twitter. Therefore, developing a social media strategy has become an essential part of every leader’s plan to get in touch with the target audience. According to Agutu (2016) with social media sites often getting more traffic than a ministries website, it’s important for National Executive Leaders to get connected.

The use of Twitter in today’s communications is not only important but also critical since millions of Kenyans are using social networks sites daily (Howard, 2011). It is an opportunity to be in touch with large numbers of audiences quickly, constantly and at a low cost (Small, 2012). It has become a common practice for most governments across the world to create accounts on social networking sites as part of their communications strategy. Social media has a significant impact on elections given its high speed of communication and the number of its able to reach (Ssozi, 2016).

Government officials and political actors are using social networking sites to appeal to the youth by generating content that people share. They also use such sites to evaluate if their leaders are delivering (Simon et.al, 2014). This shows how advancement in technology has affected government service delivery and democratic process in general. Moreover, the information generated in this study is useful to scholars, especially those who have expressed interest in new media, e-government, and communication strategists. However, there are limited studies examining how government officials are using Twitter in their communication. Therefore, by using Kenya as a case study, this study addresses the gap in research on government usage of Twitter in the East African context.

Adopting Kent and Taylor’s (1998) dialogic communication framework as the theoretical framework sheds light on how new technologies such as Twitter shape the government’s interaction with the public, and how government leaders have embraced this technology to communicate to their publics.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how the National Executive Leaders have incorporated Twitter in their official duties. The study examined if the National Executive Leaders are using Twitter as a broadcast or conversational tool and what kind of information they share on their Twitter accounts and their content strategies.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this exploratory study was to examine the extent of Twitter utilization as a communications platform by National Executive Leaders in their government duties. It was also, to investigate how they use Twitter as a medium of communications and how the NELs interacts with their constituents (followers or online audiences/communities) as well as their content strategies. As such, the sub-objectives are:

1. To find out the type of content posted on National Executive Leaders’ Twitter accounts and if they are relevant to their followers through the usefulness of information principle.

2. To find out the nature of interaction that takes place on National Executive Leaders’ Twitter accounts applying a dialogic loop principle analysis (is it two-way communication?).

3. To find out if the National Executive Leaders employ social media content strategies in their Twitter accounts, using the generation of return of visits principle.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is important because it helps the government understand whether Twitter usage is conversational or broadcast tool. It also helps the public understand if the NELs uses the platform for official reasons or personal communication. In addition, it helps the public understand if the NELs Twitter accounts are legit or parodies. The outcome of this study also informs future legislation on social media and social media policy for the national
government. It also helps the researcher weigh options of setting up a digital consultancy firm.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study focused on Twitter activities of the Kenyan National Executive Leaders (NELs), who comprised of the President, Deputy President, Cabinet Secretaries and Attorney-General. The study was conducted between, July and September 2016. The period of the study was the first quarter of the government year. The study didn’t focus on two Cabinet Secretaries, Raychelle Omamo and Jacob Kaimenyi, because they did not have Twitter accounts at the time. Although there was information associated to them, this has not been included in the main analysis.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

The National Executive Leaders are busy individuals considering that during the period of the study, the country was headed for a General Election. Thus, it was not feasible to conduct a confirmatory interview with the NELs. Other members of the government, such as Principal Secretaries, were not included in the study, but they are important to study in the future. The author did not study Ministries, and Principal Secretaries Twitter accounts because of redundancy. The study did not obtain information in relations to age, level of education, and level of comfort with technology.

1.8 Assumption of the Study

The study assumed that all members of the National Executive Leaders appreciate social media platforms as a crucial part of their governance activities in their capacity as National Executive Leaders and are on Twitter and know how to open a Twitter account. The research assumed that the followers believe that the Twitter accounts of National Executives Leaders are a credible source of information.
1.9 Conceptual Framework

The study examined the use of Twitter by National Executive Leaders. The research investigated the content posted and the Twitter account owners, which were the independent variables. Both dependent and the independent variables were tested by use of Dialogic Communications theory, to examine which of the four principles under the theoretical framework existed and were common. The study found that the usefulness of information principle was the most common dialogic tendency.
1.10 Operational Definition of Terms

*Twitter utilization* – Twitter utilization includes usage of Twitter leaders in dissemination of information, presence, posting/production, curation, engagement, and metrics quantify (Simon et.al, 2014)

*National Executive Leaders* – National executive is President, Deputy President, Cabinet Secretaries and Attorney-General (CA, 2016)

*Government activities* – announcements, diplomacy, appointment, event formal, event informal, political (Lopez-Garcia, 2016)

*Social media platforms* – these are Twitter, Facebook, YouTube and Instagram sites (Khan, Yoon, & Park, 2014)

*KOT* – Kenyans on Twitter (Simon et.al, 2014)

*Hashtags* - a word or phrase preceded by a hash or pound sign (#) and used to identify messages on a specific topic (Simon et.al, 2014)

*Retweet* – repost or forward a message posted by another user (Lopez-Garcia, 2016)

*Tweet*– a posting made on the social media website Twitter (Twiplomacy, 2016)

*Favorite/Like* - show appreciation for a Tweet or a Moment (Twiplomacy, 2016)
1.11 Chapter Summary

The chapter brought to fore the importance of the study as well as the justification of the study. Research objectives, purpose, significance, limitation and definition of terms are included in the chapter. Finally, the conceptual framework provides a roadmap of the entire study from background, variables, methodologies and theoretical framework.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This paper adopted Dialogic Communications Theory to investigate the uses of Twitter by Kenya National Executive Leaders.

2.1.1 Dialogic Communications Theory

For over a decade, the field of communications has seen a theoretical shift, from a one-way approach of managing communication to a two-way approach and relationship building through dialogue. Today, Kent and Taylor (1998), Dialogic Communication Theory has gained traction as the theoretical framework of choice for websites and social media network pages (Waters, Canfield, Foster, & Hardy, 2011), because it analyses the two-way communications approach and relationship building dialogue.

Kent and Taylor (1998) defined the approach as “any negotiated exchange of ideas and opinions.” The authors posit that dialogue is collaborative and immediate. Therefore, inherent in dialogic communication are skills from all parties including listening, contextualization of issues, finding common ground and consideration of long-term goals (Waters et al., 2011). Kent and Taylor (1998) also established a framework of five principles to examine the organizational use of dialogues and interactions on web sites. These principles are the dialogic loop, the usefulness of information, generation of return visits, ease of use/interface, and conservation of visitors.

2.1.2 Dialogic Loop

A dialogic loop is enabled when one party involved in the communication invites the other(s) to engage, interact, act, or reply (Taylor, White, & Kent, 2001).
This may be an invitation to a group chat, call to action or question prompt. Some argue that even if all four other principles of dialogic communication are met, without facilitating a dialogic loop, there is no dialogic communication (Baumgarten, 2011). According to Kent and Taylor (1998) communicators can embed the feedback loop in the tactic itself online, which allows publics to directly communicate with the organization. Sequentially, this allows organizations to directly receive questions, concerns, or problems from the public (Agozzino, 2015). Kent and Taylor (1998) assert that organizations need to make sure someone inside is dedicated and well-trained to respond to publics’ inquiries online (Agozzino, 2015).

2.1.3 Usefulness of information

The second principle, the usefulness of information, is evaluated by whether the content (either of the message, web page, tweet, email, etc.) is relevant to the organization, its goals, and the audience (Baumgarten, 2011). This information can come in a variety of forms, including information about the organization itself, current news stories, annual reports, upcoming events, ways to help the organizations and more (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010). Organization websites should strive to be the go-to place for their publics to get information pertaining to the organization. Based on this, the usefulness of information principle considers that organization websites should provide valuable information that is relevant to their publics and information that aligns with their publics’ interests, values, and concerns (Kent & Taylor, 1998). Moreover, the information should satisfy the needs of their publics (Agozzino, 2015).

2.1.4 Generation of return visits

The third is the generation of return visits principle. The same authors concluded that return visits are often generated through explicit invitations for users to return to the web page at a later date. Additionally, providing users with information
that would deepen their knowledge about the organization is another method of generating return visits (Baumgarten, 2011). The concept of propinquity (Kent & Taylor, 2002) theorizes that this is so because individuals are more likely to engage with organizations which they share closeness and familiarity. Kent and Taylor (1998) emphasize that content needs to be updated regularly by the organization, as well as their publics, for visitors to have a reason to return to the site.

2.1.5 Ease of use/interface

In previous research, the fourth principle of ease of use/interface has been used to evaluate web pages for multiple browser compatibility, speed of page loading, ease of navigability, availability of a site map, easily accessible home page (from other pages), making important links clearly identified, and having a website search box (Taylor et al., 2001). This principle is more applicable for evaluating web pages of unique origins, rather than information communicated through a single interface (as is the case with Twitter).

2.1.6 Conservation of visitors

According to Taylor et al. (2001) organizations should attempt to keep visitors on their websites as long as possible, which leads to the fifth principle, conservation of visitors. Organizations should conserve visitors by limiting unnecessary links outside of the site and providing clear paths back (Waters et al., 2011). Once a visitor leaves the site through another link he or she may never come back (Agozzino, 2015). The goal is to keep visitors on the organization’s site; thus, the site should be “interesting, informative and valuable” to organization publics (Kent & Taylor, 1998).

This framework has since been applied to a variety of organizational websites, including universities and institutions (Waters et al., 2011). Studies have investigated the potential of the dialogic approach to relationship building via an organizations’
website. These researchers have investigated a number of organizations including Fortune 500 Company websites, activist websites, community college, and charity websites. In general, researchers found organization websites were employing several features of dialogic communication in that they were easy to use, informative, and encouraged users to stay on and to return to the site (Agozzino, 2015).

Bortree and Seltzer (2009) analyzed environmental advocacy groups’ Facebook pages to determine the dialogic strategies at work on advocacy groups’ profile. Given a purposive sample of 50 environmental advocacy Facebook pages, the researchers found the advocacy groups were using usefulness of information, ease of use, and conservation of visits with regard to dialogic strategies. Additionally, the researchers found the advocacy groups were not using generation of return visits or the dialogic loop strategies. The researchers concluded the groups have great potential to increase the dialogic strategies employed by the environmental advocacy groups on Facebook as an attempt to build relations with their publics (Agozzino, 2015).

Another study considered how Fortune 500 companies facilitated dialogic communication on company Twitter accounts (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010). The researchers’ content analyzed 93 Fortune 500 companies Twitter accounts and found companies with dialogic tendencies used the conservation of visitors’ principle more but used the generation of return visits principle less than companies that did not have dialogic tendencies. Again, the researchers concluded Fortune 500 companies can increase dialogic communication on Twitter accounts significantly in order to foster relationships with their publics.

Martin, Rosaria, and Caba Perez, (2015), investigated the extent to which European local governments are developing dialogic strategies in their Twitter profiles to establish and enhance relations with their citizens and then to examine the impact of
certain factors on the implementation of these dialogic strategies. The study found the most commonly used dialogic principle is that of the conservation of visitors with 63.46 per cent, followed by the generation of visitors, 57.69 per cent and dialogic loop, 57.21 per cent. In contrast, the dialogic principle relating to information of interest to stakeholders is the least often used among local governments’ Twitter profiles (42.50 per cent). Of the four principles analyzed, that of dialogic loop presented the greatest dispersion, 41.22 per cent, which reflects the large differences in its use among certain European municipalities Martin et al. (2015).

The dialogic framework was used to analyze five principles of how the accommodation sector of the hospitality industry was employed in the Facebook posts. The study found that the accommodation sector employed the principles of dialogic communication in 97.9 per cent of the Facebook posts. The results showed frequent occurrences of three of the dialogic principles. These three principles, dialogic loop, conservation of visitors and usefulness of information appeared in over 50 per cent of total posts analyzed. The dialogic principle, generation of return visitors was the only principle to occur in less than 50 per cent of the posts (29.3 per cent). Only 2.1 per cent of posts did not use any of the dialogic principles, with the mean falling to 2.29 principles used (Muckensturm, 2013).

Water et al. (2011) study investigated how university health centers convey health messages on Facebook using dialogic strategies. The study found the fundamental principle of using social media well for an organization is to create an ongoing dialogue, a conversation with the publics that the organization serves. The results indicated that while university health centers are taking some steps to create this dialogue and initiate online conversations that address health topics of importance to college students, these organizations are not using Facebook to its fullest potential. The
study indicated that university health centers varied widely in their ability to utilize these dialogic principles to create that ongoing conversation with the campus community. Overall Water et al. (2011) showed the strongest areas of dialogic principles were the provision of useful information and conservation of visitors. The area of greatest weakness among the health centers was in the generation of return visits.

In the study, *Dialogic Communication Through “Pinning”: An Analysis of Top 10 Most followed Organizations’ Pinterest Profiles*, Agozzino (2015) found that usefulness of information principle was the highest dialogic principle at 84 per cent, the second highest principle – dialogic loop – had an index score of 75 per cent, conservation of visitors had an index score of 73 per cent, while the generation of return visits had the lowest index score of 50 per cent. Findings from a study on how U.S. non-profit organizations are using *Twitter* to foster dialogic communication found that majority of tweets from non-profits employ dialogic principles, but that two principles in particular were present in most tweets: facilitation of dialogic loop and conservation of visitors (Baumgarten, 2011).

Even though scholars are beginning to explore the dialogic tendencies of social media through particular social media tools, exploration of the dialogic capabilities of *Twitter* has attracted various scholars. This study takes the first step in determining the dialogic relationship building strategies employed on *Twitter* by Kenya’s National Executive Leaders. However, majority of the studies have found that organizations’ websites lack commitment to provide feedback through the dialogic loop, thus missing out on the relationship building opportunities afforded by the online environment and a key element to the public relations practice.

Today, the theory is among the most commonly used to explain the interactive capability of the Internet as a channel for establishing social relationships, by positively
influencing the frequency of communication, improving user satisfaction and strengthening trust between organizations and their stakeholders (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Waters et al., 2011; Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010). Thus, the theory explains how increasing the interactivity of the internet contributes to the construction of social relations.

Therefore, this study used Kent and Taylor’s (1998) theoretical framework for dialogic communication to assess how new media facilitate Kenya’s National Executive Leaders communication. The principles analyzed were the dialogic loop, the usefulness of information, generation of return visits, and conservation of visitors. The ease of use/interface principle was omitted from the coding process of the NELs because all Twitter accounts are essentially using the same platform, which eliminates the need to examine the interface, itself (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010).

2.2 Research Questions

1. What is the type of interactions that takes place on National Executive Leaders Twitter accounts by applying the dialogic loop principle?
2. Is the type of content posted on National Executive Leader Twitter accounts relevant to their followers by employing the usefulness of information principle?
3. Do the National Executive Leaders employ social media content strategies in their Twitter accounts by applying the generation of return of visits principle?

The following section provides an explanation of the research questions, tools to test them and how they fit into the theoretical framework.

1. What is the type (nature) of interactions that takes place on National Executive Leaders Twitter accounts by applying the dialogic loop principle?
• Replies, mentions & hashtags

The final principle – dialogic loop – is concerned with the discussion taking place between the organization and its publics online. The current study operationalized the dialogic loop principle as an opportunity for followers to mentions, reply, and create a hashtag to engage with the Twitter account owner.

2. Is the type of content posted on National Executive Leader Twitter accounts relevant to their followers by employing the usefulness of information principle?
   • Government versus the non-government type of content
   • Retweets and likes (broadcast or conversational)

   The dialogic principle of the usefulness of information seeks to provide information to Twitter account followers, based on ideologies, knowledge or understanding, and also to share the information.

3. Do the National Executive Leaders employ social media content strategies in their Twitter accounts by applying Generation of Return of Visits Principles?
   • New followers during the study
   • Average tweets per day
   • Total number of new tweets (period studied)

   Understanding the importance of repeat visitors is the underpinning of the generation of return visits principle as time and repeated exposure is necessary for relationships to form (Taylor, et al., 2001). The elements identified as features encouraging followers to return were likes and retweets. Rybalko and Seltzer (2010) operationalized generation of return visits as new followers and average tweets a day.

2.3 Overview of Twitter

   Social media networks have changed the way we communicate. One may argue that we have always interacted through dialogue and debate, but there is no question
that the social media platforms and tools that are freely available to us today are taking this to the next level. Khasawneh and Abu-Shanab (2013) observe that social media networks enable people to converse and communicate in an easy and cheap way. According to Khan, Yoon, and Park (2014), social media is a set of online communication tools that support social interaction between users. That is why one of the benefits of social media is that it facilitates people to share information within their profiles and view content and information in other connected profiles within a bounded environment.

Khasawneh and Abu-Shanab (2013), note that social media is imperative, because people have a two-way information flow. Khan et al. (2014) assert that Twitter is the most prominent social networking site with many government organizations considering it as the most effective channel for distributing information and communication with citizens.

2.3.1 Twitter use by political actors and elites

According to a study conducted by Burson-Masteller, a US-based communication firm, Twitter was identified as the social networking platform of choice for governments and foreign ministries judging by the number of governments on the platform. Burson-Marsteller studied 793 Twitter accounts belonging to Heads of State and government in 173 countries, representing 90 percent of all UN member states, with a combined audience of 324 million followers. All European and South American countries have a presence on the social network, although some of the accounts, such as that of San Marino’s Captain Regent, are inactive. Former U.S. President Barack Obama is still the uncontested leader of the digital world. His @BarackObama Twitter account has over 75 million followers (Twiplomacy, 2016). Pope Francis (@Pontifex)
is the second-most followed world leader with more than 28 million followers on his nine language accounts.

Kenya’s Uhuru Kenyatta @UKenyatta has become Sub-Saharan Africa’s most followed leader with over 2.1 million followers, closely followed by Rwanda’s @PaulKagame and ahead of South Africa’s presidential administration (@PresidencyZA), which has 673,000 followers (Twiplomacy, 2016). Deputy President William Ruto is the seventh most followed person in Kenya with 1.1 followers Socialbakers, (2016) and the second government official with a huge following. Twitter came to the scene as a political tool during the 2008 United States of America (USA) elections. In that year, Barack Obama used Twitter extensively to promote his election and many researchers credited his use of the platform for his win. That year, Obama used various social networking sites, including Facebook and YouTube extensively to promote his election campaign, and many researchers give credit (Evans, Cordova, & Sipole, 2014).

Lopez-Garcia (2016) conducted a study on Twitter during the campaign for the 2015 general election in Spain. She focussed on the leaders of the main Spanish political parties. The researcher discovered that Twitter was used to enhance cohesion among followers, party activists, sympathiser as well as to bolster the image of the presidential candidates in the media and in political rallies. Lopez-Garcia (2016) further found out that the social media tool was leveraged to disseminate the candidate's messages, while at the same time magnifying their campaign activities on the network.

Straus et al. (2013) studied the adoption of Twitter in the 111th US Congress and found out that House Members and Senate decision to register Twitter accounts were driven by their desire to deliver their message to a wider audience. Evans et al. (2014) analyzed 67,119 tweets of 1,119 candidates while examining Twitter utilization during
2012 US elections. The study indicated that on average the candidates tweeted 88 times in two months – period understudy. Evans et al. (2014) assumed that candidates post messages for themselves, further revealing that they spent one-third of their time on Twitter talking about their campaign, with only 29 per cent of tweets falling under the personal category.

2.3.2 Content strategies: Twitter in political communication

Twitter’s 140 (now 280 characters) conversation has revolutionized how political leaders connect with their platform audiences. The advent of new media has led to significant changes in how governments communicate with their electorates and citizens. First, the ‘move from personal websites to blogs and blog site aggregation, from publishing to participation, from web content as the outcome of large up-front investment to an ongoing and interactive process, and from content management systems to links based on tagging (folksonomy)’ Ssozi (2016) equalized the communication landscape among political players. The popularity of YouTube, blogs, and social networking sites among politicians and political candidates is demonstrated in their adoption during periods of intensive political campaigning, such as the 2007–2008 US presidential primaries (Segado-Boj et al., 2015).

Technology users’ young demographics and web 2.0’s viral reach hold a further attraction to political parties and candidates as they are able to reach out to youths, a group, which may not be exposed to traditional forms of political communication, in a more effective and efficient way (Small, 2012). Second, as social networking sites tend to appeal more to younger voters, the government’s discourse assumes a more personal and less official nature (Segado-Boj et al., 2015). The personalized nature of social networking sites such as MySpace also fosters greater emotional intimacy between politicians and their electorate (Barbera, 2014). Political fandom on social networking
sites creates a new way of doing politics that was not possible in old media such as newspapers, television, and even traditional candidate websites (Barbera, 2014).

In addition, such spaces also foster a sense of collectivism among users, evident in a study of Cyworld, a Korean social networking site (Park, Kang, Rho, & Lee, 2016). Similarly, political figures in Asia are using the internet to voice their criticisms concerning government policies and to engage in dialogues with the public (e.g. Malaysia’s ex-Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad blog at http://chedet.co.cc/chedetblog/). In India, politicians are using websites, blogs, Facebook, and Twitter to reach out to about 83 million internet users leading up to the 2009 General Election (Fuchs, 2012).

Politicians are thus demonstrating an increasingly acute ability to maximize the immediacy and multi-modality of new media technologies. However, existing research remains western-centric and focuses primarily on technology use during periods of high political activities (Segado-Boj et al. 2015). Scant attention is paid to the ways in which new media differ from web 1.0 technologies and how they help governments cultivate and manage relationships on a daily basis.

2.3.3 Government activities: Twitter in Government

Today, governments across the world are using Twitter and many are active online, providing citizens with information and assistance. Small (2012) study can be counted among the first attempts to understand how Twitter is being used by governments. Echle (2015) studied the use of Twitter by US Congress members. In their study, they analyzed the regularity of posting, demographic distribution of members as well as the content of the collected tweets.

Alam and Lucas (2011) also examined the use of Twitter by the Australian Government. They examined the use of the platform by the various agencies and the
interaction with the citizens. They found out that government agencies use tweets to disseminate and broadcast news, provide updates about their agencies, and provide information about their events. On citizens’ interactions, Alam and Lucas (2011) found that the interactions were feedback-based and that citizens promoted the government tweets by sharing links or retweeting.

Khan, Yoon, and Park (2014) studied the use of Twitter by the central government in Korea and the federal government in the USA. The researchers used webometric techniques to obtain information on the respective government twitter activities, such as the number of followers, followings, and tweets. In their analysis, Khan et al., (2014) found out that the Korean government leveraged Twitter to encourage collective cooperation between ministries, while the US government was more individualistic. Their study further found out that the Korean ministries were well connected on Twitter networks and used the social media tool to pursue a wider goal, while the US Government departments were not well-connected and their intent was to communicate through tweets rather than forming a collective agenda.

Panagiotopoulos and Sams (2011) also conducted a study that examined the adoption and use of Twitter in the UK local government. The researchers found out that London Local Authorities had embraced the platform in their strategies to the extent that they were using hashtags to promote their events. Therefore, they concluded that the Local Authorities have to a certain degree ‘embraced fully’ the use of Twitter in support of citizen-government interactions.

Park et al. (2016) examined Twitter communication between citizens and government leaders by studying 398 Korean followers who followed the Minister of Central Government. They observed that the government’s information delivery through a leading officer’s Twitter feed impacts the officer-to-citizen credibility and
that citizens’ perception of credibility is connected to their trust in an agency. This trust expanded to trust in the central government, and the citizens’ trust in Twitter as a governmental medium positively influenced this expansion.

Another study looked at the usage of Twitter by the Canadian government. Small (2012) concluded that the Canadian government is yet to fully embrace Twitter. This is despite the fact that Web 2.0 offers governments numerous new opportunities to engage with citizens, and evidence that Canadians desire this type of relationship.

Khan et al. (2014) argue that governments across the world have started appreciating the use of Twitter, to the extent that they have published social media guidelines and strategies. Since 2009, the US, Australia, and the UK, among others, have produced guidelines for using social media in accordance with each country’s social media objectives (Khan et al., 2014).

Therefore, such policies and strategies guide users by helping them to increase their presence on Twitter. This study will try to examine if the Kenyan government has social media policies and guidelines. For example, Simon et al. (2014) established that lack of social media standard operating procedures during the Westgate Mall attack led to confusion of Twitter messages. “The fact that during the night there was a pause in Twitter updates to the public, sometimes for up to ten hours, suggests that only one person operated the social media account, lacking replacements or organized shifts,” (Simon et al., 2014, p46).

This study will not take an assumption that Cabinet Secretaries and the Attorney General tweet for themselves. Previous literature has not examined, who tweets for who and the effectiveness of Twitter strategy and guidelines.

2.3.4 Interactions: Twitter in Kenya’s political and Government communications
Despite the growth and recognition of Kenya as the second most active tweeting country in Africa after South Africa (Simon et al., 2014), there are few scholarship articles that have studied the use of the platform in politics. A study by Wasswa (2013) that investigated the role of social media in the 2013 presidential election campaigns, found out that the candidates integrated social media into their campaigns. This platform was majorly used to share information on campaign activities, the debate on issues, share photos, videos and links, update their followers, solicit for funds, and counter propaganda. These findings further revealed that although presidential candidates integrated social media into their campaigns they were yet to exploit its full potential and that social media by itself could not guarantee a candidate victory in elections.

The study further analyzed the trends in media use and reliance and revealed that television and radio were the most popular source of political information on the presidential campaigns for the respondents, while social network sites, specifically Facebook and Twitter were the second most popular. These findings showed that although more people are getting online for political news and information, they heavily rely on traditional media for the same news. Social media, however, had a significant impact on the campaign process (Wasswa, 2013).

Bing (2015) studied social media and politics in Kenya’s 2013 General Election. The author concluded that new communication platforms such as Twitter and Facebook have reshaped political realities in Kenya. While politicians and voters are shifting their communicative habits by incorporating mobile phones and social media into their endeavors, political practices have changed considerably (Bing, 2015). Today, social media in Kenya has supplemented rather than replaced common political practices, creating an alternative political sphere, stimulating political participation and widening
democratic debates by transcending hierarchies and creating more informal communicative networks (Bing, 2015). The study further found that new media is progressively lowering the barriers of political integration by facilitating and increasing opportunities for many to interact, offering new ways of coming together and organizing political action.

Simon et al. (2014) affirmed that Twitter is highly used in Kenya and has become a popular platform for sharing information. For example, Chief Francis Kariuki uses Twitter to fight crime in his locality.

2.3.5 Kenyan on Twitter (#KOT)

Tully and Ekdale (2014) also found out that Kenyans on Twitter (KOT) use hashtags to condemn government corruption, respond to media misrepresentation and participate in global conversations in a ‘playful’ way. They also found out that KOT has grasped the art of communicating by the use of jokes and cautioned that KOT interactions should not be dismissed as irrelevant just because they are activists.

Simon et al. (2014) studied the use of Twitter during emergency situations with a case study of Kenya’s the Westgate Mall attack. The study reviewed a total of 67,849 tweets, all categorized based on geographical locations, terror attack, social support and organizations. Simon et al. (2014) claimed that the profusion of various Twitter accounts providing official information made it difficult to follow the flow of information. They also reported that security breaches during the rescue mission contributed to the sharing of sensitive data and that sometimes misinformation was corrected after two days. They also concluded that social media offered an accessible, widely available means for a two-way flow of information between the public and authorities.
Twitter has also been used by Kenyans to condemn misrepresentation of the country. According to Dearden (2015) KOT ridiculed US network for publishing six inaccurate headlines in reference to activities happening in Kenya, which resulted to CNN Boss Tony Maddox meeting President Uhuru Kenyatta at State House, Nairobi and agreeing to position Kenya correctly and promote its tourist destinations.

2.4 Study Gap

Web 2.0 is becoming ubiquitous in many countries (Small, 2012), and many believe that all governments and political elite/actors will need to respond to this changing technological context in terms of promoting their own programmes and policies and connecting with citizens (Holland, 2008). Clearly, there is much of academic work that needs to be done, in terms of other single-country analyses, comparative analyses, and other Web 2.0 technologies. That’s why this study investigated how National Executive Leaders in Kenya are using Twitter as a mode of communications. This study contributes to the burgeoning literature by presenting an initial dataset and approach for conceptualizing Twitter in communicating government activities, which is analyzed using Kent and Taylor (1998) Dialogic Principles.

2.5 Chapter Summary

The chapter reviewed literature on Twitter’s utilization in political campaigns, elections, government, and on how previous studies have covered Kenyans’ use of Twitter. Also included in this section is the theoretical framework which has elaborated more on the dialogic communications principles. Although, most studies have focussed on the utilization of Twitter political elites, there is a need for future researchers to examine Twitter strategies and who tweets for who. Africa and Kenya are no exemptions and have not conducted studies that look into the use of Twitter in advancing governments’ agenda – as broadcast or conversational tools. This research
provides information on the Kenyan government’s use of Twitter as a communication tool. Clearly, much academic work needs to be done in terms of other single-country Twitter analyses, comparative analyses, and other Web 2.0 technologies. This analysis contributes to the burgeoning literature by presenting an initial dataset and approach for conceptualizing Twitter in government communications.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the various stages and phases that were followed in completing the study. It involves the collection, measurement and analysis of data.

3.1 Research Design

Research design refers to the method used to carry out a research. Creswell (2009) defined research design as the scheme, outline or plan used to generate answers to research problems. This research design applied to this study was exploratory content analysis. The study sought to examine Twitter use by the National Executive Leaders by exploring the extent of adoption, content posted and the nature of interactions by using dialogic principle theories. The dialogic principles used were the dialogic loop, the usefulness of information, and the generation of visits. The study’s approach was the quantitative content analysis method. Creswell (2009) posits that content analysis is indigenous to communication research and is potentially one of the most important research techniques in the social sciences. It seeks to analyze data within a specific context in view of the meanings someone- group or a culture – attributes to them.

Creswell (2009) further notes that content analysis is valuable to communication research, because it allows researchers to examine the nuances of behavior change, stakeholder perceptions, and societal trends. Content analysis also allows researchers to analyze socio-cognitive and perceptual constructs that are difficult to study via traditional quantitative archival methods (Creswell, 2009). At the same time, it allows researchers to gather large samples that may be difficult to employ in purely qualitative studies. For example, Park et al., (2016) study on Twitter communication with government leaders used content analysis to obtain information from the respondents.
Banday and Mattoo (2013) and Panagiotopoulos and Sam (2012) successfully employed content analysis to investigate the embracement and usage of Twitter by governments, elected leaders, and political candidates. Although content analysis is increasingly used by management researchers as a tool to analyze text and qualitative data, many researchers are unfamiliar with the various content analysis techniques and how to deal with the challenges inherent in its application. These challenges include finding adequate measures, developing proxy dictionaries and coding schemes, working with texts from various sources, ensuring reliability and validity, and conducting manual versus computer-aided content analysis (Creswell, 2009).

In conventional content analysis, coding categories are derived directly from the text data. With a directed approach, the analysis starts with a theory or relevant research findings as guidance for initial codes. A summative content analysis involves counting and comparisons, usually of keywords or content, followed by the interpretation of the underlying context. The author delineates analytic procedures specific to each approach and techniques addressing trustworthiness with hypothetical examples. For example, Lopez-Garcia (2016) study on the Twitter use in Spain Election used content analysis and discourse analysis to obtain information. “Through this combination of methodologies, we aim to provide an overview as broad and complete as possible, in order to properly test our initial hypothesis, (Lopez-Garcia, 2016).”

3.2 Population and Sampling Design

The study employed the census sampling method. This is because the size of the population was small, considering that there were only 23 National Executive Leaders. According to Wimmer and Dominick (2006) the process of examining every member of the population is called a census.
3.3 Data Collection Methods

Quantitative content analysis was employed to collect data and establish the usage of Twitter by National Executive leaders from July to September 2016. The period of the study was chosen because it is when the government year starts and Budget released. Content analysis was used to investigate the utilization of Twitter by the National Executive Leaders. Wimmer and Dominick (2006) define content analysis as a method of studying and analyzing communication in a systematic, objective and quantitative manner for the purpose of measuring variables. They argue that content analysis has three concepts: systematic, objective and quantitative. On systematic, the authors explain that the content to be analyzed has to be selected according to explicit and consistently applied rules and that all content has to be treated in exactly the same manner. They also posit that the researcher’s idiosyncrasies and biases should not enter into the findings, while quantitative is applied in the concept to aid precision of data. A number of studies (Banday & Mattoo, 2013; Panagiotopoulos & Sam, 2012; Small, 2012) successfully employed content analysis to investigate the embracement and usage of Twitter by the governments, elected leaders, and political candidates.

3.3.1 The unit of analysis

The unit of analysis for identifying government and non-government related variables was a tweet. A variable was counted once in the tweet. A tweet has 140 characters, so there were no tweets which contained two or more variables. Today, Twitter has increased the characters to 280. The increase of character was implemented in November, 2017. This move doesn’t affect this study, because during data collection the characters analyzed were 140. The unit of analysis is based on the “meaning of the message in or the structure of the content along some continuum or classification scheme” (Small, 2012).
3.3.2 Content categories

The following are the definitions of the eight content categories examined.

1. Diplomacy is any mention of foreign leaders (Presidents, Prime Ministers, Foreign Affairs Ministers, Ambassadors, UN related leaders) meeting with a National Executive Leader.

2. Announcement (service delivery) is any mention of any tweet disseminating new information in-form of news (this was determined by the 4W’s and 1H).

3. Appointment is any mention of an individual promotion within the government.

4. Event Formal is any mention of a National Executive Leader in an event related to his/her docket, conferences, forums, seminars, workshops, launches, ceremonies or national events.

5. Event Informal is any mention of a National Executive Leader in an event not related to his/her docket or attending a national event not related to his/her docket.

6. Political is any mention of a political party, political rally, voters, elections, grass-root mobilization, debates and with politicians.

7. Feedback is any tweet containing responses to a user (follower).

8. Non-Government related is any tweet containing family, personal views etc.

   This study adapted Alam and Lucas (2011) categories. The study also investigated the nature of the interaction between National Executive Leaders and their followers (retweets, likes/favorites, hashtags, replies and mentions). These interaction categories were adapted from (Ssozi, 2016).

   The tweets were coded in line with Evans et al., (2014) study. The researcher investigated the type of content posted on National Executive Leaders Twitter accounts, if they were government related or not government related. This content was classified
into various categories; diplomacy, announcements, appointments, events formals, events informal, feedback and political.

According to Alam and Lucas (2011), the main aim of classifying communicative activities into genre analysis is by understanding the purpose and the type of communications. Therefore, the study applied genre analysis to classify National Executive Leaders tweets. The classification of tweets was adapted from an earlier study of Australian government adoption of Twitter (Alam & Lucas, 2011). Liu (2013) also adapted similar classification in the study, microblogging use by the Chinese government.

Importantly, Twitter supports multiple forms of interactions – with the tweets and among users – for instance tweet, retweet, favorites, reply, hashtags, message and follow (Ssozi, 2016). For example, when a user favorites or retweets another user’s tweet, he/she is interacting with the platform and content but not directly contributing to the conversation. On the other hand, when one user tweets or replies to another user’s tweet, it is arguable that he or she is directly initiating a conversation (Ssozi, 2016).

The current study used the dialogic communications principles to analyze the use of Twitter by Kenya National Executive Leaders in their daily work. To analyze the dialogic principles, the study operationalized dialogic principles based on (Taylor et al., 2001) and (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010) studies. All the tweets were analyzed and coded based on the definitions adapted from the coding schemes used by (Taylor et al., 2001) and (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010).

3.4 Data Analysis Procedures

The codebook (Appendix A) was adapted from Alam and Lucas (2011) so it would be applicable to Twitter given that the NELs had minimal control over the features available on Twitter and the ease of interface principle was eliminated in this
analysis. Past studies examining dialogic communication on social media have also eliminated the ease of interface principle given that organizations do not control features imbedded on the interface (Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010). The following section details how the remaining four features of dialogic principles were operationalized:

The dialogic principle of the usefulness of information seeks to provide information to Twitter’s account followers, based on ideologies, knowledge or understanding, but also to share the information. Twitter’s feature that facilitates this principle is the ‘What’s happening’ text board. If the content shared on this text board is not clearly understood, the followers will not have accurate information. Rybalko and Seltzer (2010) operationalized the usefulness of information as tweets with information about the organization.

Understanding the importance of repeat visitors is the underpinning of the generation of return visits principle as time and repeated exposure is necessary for relationships to form (Taylor, et al., 2001). The following elements were identified as features encouraging followers to return were likes and retweets. Rybalko and Seltzer (2010) operationalized generation of return visits as likes/favorites and retweets. The authors posit that followers explicitly return to a Twitter page to like or retweet information.

The dialogic loop is concerned with the discussion taking place between the organization and their users online. The current study operationalized the dialogic loop principle as an opportunity for followers to mentions, reply and create a hashtag to engage with the account owner. Rybalko and Seltzer (2010) operationalized dialogic loop as replies to followers, mentions, retweets and hashtags.
Note that the ease of use, interface principle, and conservation of visitors were omitted from the analysis of the study, because all Twitter accounts are essentially using the same platform, which eliminates the need to examine the interface itself.

All National Executive Leaders (President, Deputy President, Attorney General and 21 Cabinet Secretaries) were selected for this study. The population was small to study; therefore, Census Sampling was ideal for the study. In a nutshell, National Executive Leaders were considered suitable for the present study, because of the docket they handle and they are the vision carrier in the country.

This study covered the period between 1st July and 30th September 2016, i.e., the period when the government year starts. In total, 3452 tweets, which was some total tweets that appeared in all National Executive Leaders Twitter account. Three Cabinet Secretaries: Cleophas Mailu, Willy Bett, and Henry Rotich didn’t post anything on their Twitter accounts during the period, while two of the National Executive leaders i.e. Jacob Kaimenyi and Raychelle Omamo were not on Twitter. Twitonomy, a software that can mine historical Twitter data was used to analyze tweets during the study period. A total of 3452 tweets were studied. Data analysis was carried out with help of Microsoft Excel 2010 and SPSS Software 2015. SPSS software was also being used to analyze chi squares and correlations in the data obtained through Twitonomy.

Two graduate students, including the author, served as coders in this study. An hour training was conducted to explain the coding procedure and definitions in the code book. Before the formal test, the coding book was pre-tested on 200 tweets from 4 accounts that were excluded from the formal sample. Wimmer and Dominik (2006) recommend that a subsample of the data collected probably between 10 per cent and 25 per cent be re-analyzed by independent coders to calculate intercoder reliability coefficient. Then two coders had a meeting to discuss the discord items and unify the
understandings. The coding book was revised according to the result of pre-test and discussion between two coders. After modifying of the coding book and clarifying of definitions, these two coders reviewed and coded the 3452 tweets for the formal test.

3.5 Study’s Reliability and Validity

*Cohen Kappa’s* reliability coefficient for all eight variables that were tested were as follows: Announcement (service delivery) .76; Diplomacy .74; Event Formal .76; Event Informal 1.0; Feedback .74; Non-Government 1.0; Political 1.0; and Appointment 1.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kappa</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0</td>
<td>Poor agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 – 0.20</td>
<td>Slight agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21 – 0.40</td>
<td>Fair agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 – 0.60</td>
<td>Moderate agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 – 0.80</td>
<td>Substantial agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 – 1.00</td>
<td>Almost perfect agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Landis and Koch (1977)

Figure 2 *Cohen Kappa reliability table that shows the coefficients*

Wimmer and Dominick (2006) argue that coefficients of .90 or greater are nearly always acceptable, .80 or greater is acceptable in most situations and .70 is appropriate in exploratory studies. The test was carried out from an online utility known as ReCal (“Reliability Calculator”) that computes intercoder/interrater reliability coefficients for nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio-level data. The online tool has been used widely in various communications, and technologies (Baysal, 2014) and (Baysal, Holmes & Godfrey, 2014).

Six out of eight variables yielded coefficients of .75 and above the required *kappa’s* reliability of .70, this therefore means that the data is valid. Wimmer and Dominick (2006) suggest that if the reliability coefficient is low, the results of the study have little validity. The content analysis guide contained well defined variables thus the two coders were able to achieve the recommended *kappa reliability*. 
In this study, the researcher employed face validity to examine the validity of the research. Face validity is considered to be a superficial method of validity measure as it only takes into consideration what the research or survey appears to measure, and not what it really measures.

Wimmer and Dominick (2006) explain that the validation technique assumes that the research instrument adequately measured what it was purported to measure, whether the categories were rigidly and satisfactorily defined, and if the analysis procedure was adequately conducted. *Cohen kappa's reliability* is generally thought to be a more robust measure than simple percent agreement calculation, since $\kappa$ considers the possibility of the agreement occurring by chance.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DATA PRESENTATION

This chapter presents the data analysis using various statistical tools for different constructs and variables in the study. Data obtained was coded, analyzed and converted into quantitative summary reports for analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Data were entered into the programme under specific category from which analysis was run to obtain descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies and percentages. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Using a content analysis technique, the data was coded, put into theme categories and tallied in terms of the number of times it occurred.

This chapter presents the findings of the research study; based on the three research questions, which are content shared, social media content strategies, and the nature of interactions. It also reveals the extent to which National Executive leaders are using dialogic principles of communication on their Twitter accounts.

4.1 Type (Nature) of Interactions’ that take place on National Executive Leaders Twitter Accounts

To answer the first research question on the nature of interactions that takes place on NELs Twitter accounts a series of analyses was conducted on SPSS version 15.0 and MS Excel 2016, which comprised of frequencies, cross tabulations, and Chi Square. This research question examined the existence of dialogic loop principle. The dialogic loop is an important principle amongst organizations and institution because it facilitates two-way communications. Even, if all other dialogic principles are employed, without creating a dialogic loop, it is argued that interactions and engagements are not present. In many instances, the dialogic loop principle is underutilized in
communications because organizations are fearful of negative feedback (Baumgarten, 2011).

In this study, the dialogic loop principle was investigated by examining mentions, replies and hashtags features. These three represent interactions on Twitter, between followers and account owners, while at the same time promoting two-way communications. Out of 3,452 tweets analyzed, only 2,021 tweets contained the three Twitter interaction features that were examined (replies, mentions & hashtags). Of the 2,021 interaction tweets sampled, replies had the least tweets with 5 per cent, hashtags had 49 per cent, while mentions had 48 per cent. National Executive leaders made significant use of hashtags but underutilized replies.

A further examination of the interactions features in comparison with total tweets during the study period, using a distribution scale of (0, 1-50, 51-100, 151-200 and 201-250) revealed that 94.4 per cent of replies were distributed in the 1-50 scale, while 61.1 per cent of mentions in the tweets analyzed, were distributed in the 1-50, scale, 22.2 per cent mentions were distributed in the 51-100 scale, while only 5.6 per cent mentions were found in 201-250 tweets category. Therefore, the National Executive Leaders utilized mentions feature in their tweet more than replies. This means that the National Executive leaders posted new content by tagging their Ministries or PS’s but forgot to bolster their post by engaging followers. The mention feature is commonly used to tag another Twitter user to deepen/bolter a conversation. This is done when a user wants to reach a wider audience, whom they share a common goal or idea. The study found 38.9 per cent of tweets with hashtags were distributed in 1-50 scale, 27.8 per cent tweets with hashtags were distributed in 101-150 scale, 22.2% of hashtags were distributed in 51-100 scale, while 11.1 per cent of the tweets analyzed didn’t have any hashtags features. A hashtag is clickable and can be a badge of sorts for
tweets related to live events or conferences or narrow topics, but beyond that utility, it
doesn't alter your tweet's distribution. In conclusion, the study found that 94.4 per cent
of replies were below the 50 scale, 61.1 per cent of the mentions were also below the 50
scale, while 61.1 per cent of hashtags were above the 50 scale. Therefore, National
Executive leaders utilized hashtags more than replies and mentions.

In addition, an SPSS cross tabulation analysis of interactions was conducted to
establish, the presence of dialogic loop principle in the research question. A 5-Likert
scale was developed with a distribution level ranging from lowest to highest (as
indicated in Table 4.5). Lowest was characterized by 0 tweets, Low (1-50 tweets),
Average (51-100), High (101-150) and highest (151≥).

Table 4. 1 Distribution of Standard Deviation on Interactions Features examined during the
study indicates that the mean was at 0.83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.4259</td>
<td>.83783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above 4.1 shows that most interactions were distributed in the 1-50
category representing a mean of 2.4, further confirming that there were fewer
interactions between the leaders and their followers.
An examination of interactions that combined all replies, mentions and hashtags features found that majority of National Executive leaders had low interactions with their followers at 66.7 per cent, while only 1.9 per cent of the understudy had highest interactions with their followers, 14.8 per cent had average interactions, 13 per cent had high interactions while 3.7 per cent had lowest interactions. The table 4.2 indicated that replies scored highly on low interactions amongst other features at 33.3 per cent, mentions scored 20.4 per cent, while hashtags scored 13 per cent. The study did not find any representation of highest interactions on both replies and hashtags. Both mentions and hashtag features interactions were similar at 7.4 per cent.

Table 4.3 The distribution of interaction Features in a Likert's Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of distribution</th>
<th>Interaction Level Likert’s Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 shows that Low interaction was recorded in the interaction tweets analyzed. Table 4.3 shows the mean at 1.4, which is over 90 per cent of the standard deviation.

Chi-square test results are displayed in Table 4.4. The results show that the relationship between interactions features (hashtags, replies and mentions) and the interaction levels is statistically significant since p-value (0.008) is less than 0.05 threshold. Therefore, the interaction level of the National Executive Leader was significantly influenced by interaction features.

Table 4.4 Chi Square interpretation of interaction features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.595a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>25.220</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>5.698</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 12 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33.

Despite a majority of National Executive leaders utilizing, hashtags in their interactions, the study found that they do not employ dialogic loop in their Twitter interactions. This was evidenced by low scores (as shown in Table which indicates that out of the 54 entries, 36 which was the majority had low interactions). This is further complimented by the Table 4.2 that shows the combined interactions, 66.7 per cent was low, 14.8 per cent average, 13 per cent high and 1.9 per cent highest. The most used type of interaction was the hashtag because many people can see and leverage to champion a cause (Dearden, 2015).

Despite the utilization of the interaction features by the National Executive Leaders, the study found that the dialogic loop principle was underutilized. This
confirms, Bortree and Seltzer (2009) study that analyzed environmental advocacy groups’ Facebook pages to determine the dialogic strategies at work on advocacy groups’ profile. The study found the dialogic loop strategies. Rybalko and Seltzer, (2010) study looked into how Fortune 500 companies facilitated dialogic communication on company Twitter accounts. The researchers’ found that companies had low dialogic loop principles tendencies used the conservation of visitors’ principle more but used the generation of return visits principle less than companies that did not have dialogic tendencies.

4.2 Type of Content Posted on National Executive Leader Twitter Accounts and its Relevance to Audiences

To answer RQ2 on the type of content posted by NELs a Cochran and Cross Tabulation tests were carried out. This research question tested the presence of usefulness of information principle. The usefulness of information is the extent to which updates posted by the leaders on Twitter appeals to the followers. To obtain the data, Twitonomy software was used. A further analysis and classification of tweets were conducted by two coders. This was done in accordance with the coding book. The variables investigated were announcements, appointments, diplomacy, political, feedback, event formal, and event informal, which were classified as government related. Out of 3,452 tweets coded, governance related information accumulated 3,223 tweets. Figure 2 shows that out of 3,223 tweets, there were 1,740 (53.99 per cent) that contained announcement messages, event formal had 866 tweets (26.87 per cent) in total, political tweets were 238 (7.38 per cent) in total, diplomacy tweets were 171 (5.31 per cent) in total, feedback tweets were 137 (4.25 per cent) in total, event informal tweets were 66 (2.05 per cent) while appointment tweets were only five (0.16 per cent).
A Cochran test, which was conducted to evaluate differences among related proportions, was significant, $\chi^2 (6, N=3223) =137.04$, $p = .000$. Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted using a McNemars’ test and controlling for familywise error rate at the .05 level using the LSD procedure. The proportion of announcements was significantly higher than event formal ($p= .048$) and afterwards contents ($p= .000$). The proportion also differed between diplomacy and event informal ($p= .001$), Event formal and event informal ($p= .009$), announcement and diplomacy ($p= .000$).
Table 4.5 An analysis of content posted by NELs

OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>53.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Formal</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomacy</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Informal</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N= 3223

From Table 4.5, Twitter provided information related to government activities. The National Executive Leaders used Twitter to publicize their departmental activities. They also used it to communicate their work, events, and policies to the wider public. Tweets with a political nature in content were posted by Cabinet Secretaries who had a prior political background such as Najib Balala, Charles Keter and Eugene Wamalwa.

A frequency test was conducted to evaluate the distribution and proportion of government-related content and unrelated government content as shown by Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Analysis of NELs Nature of Tweets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Nature of Tweets</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Related</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Government Related</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test found that 87.5 per cent of the National Executive leaders posted content related to government activities while 12.5 per cent posted content unrelated to government activities. Therefore, the usefulness of information principle was most apparent in the study. From the data analyzed, over 87.5 per cent of National Executive Leaders shared government related information. The leaders’ Twitter accounts provided
updates about governance that were consumed by their followers. In addition, all National Executive Leaders posted information related to their ministries and cross ministries.

A further analysis was undertaken to determine if Twitter is used as a conversational or a broadcast communication tool as shown in Table 4.7. Conversation promotes two-way communications, while broadcasting is the amplification of a message. Ssozi (2016) argues that Twitter supports multiple forms of interactions, for instance tweeting, retweeting, replying, favoriting, messaging, and following. Water et al.’s (2011) study investigated how university health centers conveyed health messages on Facebook using dialogic strategies. The study found that the fundamental principle of using social media properly for an organization is to create an ongoing dialogue, a conversation with the publics that the organization serves. The results indicated that while university health centers were taking some steps to create this dialogue and initiate online conversations that addressed health topics of importance to college students, these organizations were not making use of Facebook to its fullest potential. The study indicated that university health centers varied widely in their ability to utilize these dialogic principles in creating ongoing conversations with the campus community. Overall, this study concurs with Water et al.’s. (2011) study that shows the strongest areas of dialogic principles were the provision of useful information and conservation of visitors. The area of greatest weakness among the health centers was the generation of return visits.
The study found that a third of tweets 33.3 per cent posted by the National Executive Leaders during the study period got liked/favorited type of engagement by the followers. A third of the tweets liked/favorited were in the category of 201-300. In the 1-100 category of tweets, the study found that at least 27.8 per cent of the followers liked/favorited the tweets, while 5.6 per cent of the followers liked/favorited tweets that fell in 501-600 category.

### Table 4.7 No. of tweets liked/favorited and total tweets Cross tabulation

**Tweet Liked vs Total Tweets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of tweets liked/favorited * total tweets Cross tabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total tweets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 Chi Square analysis on Twitter use by NELs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>45.818a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>29.799</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>13.870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 25 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

Table 4.8 which displays chi-square test results, shows that the relationship between total tweets studied and total tweets favorited/liked is statistically significant
since p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 threshold. Therefore, the likes/favorited tweets were of National Executive Leader was significantly influenced by the total number of tweets.

Table 4. 9 No. of tweet retweeted and total tweets Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of tweet retweeted</th>
<th>Total Tweets</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. 10 A Chi Square analysis of tweets studied and tweets retweeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>46.750*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>29.909</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>11.550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 30 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

The chi-square table 4.10 shows that the relationship between total tweets studied and total tweets retweeted is statistically significant since p-value (0.001) is less than 0.05 threshold. Therefore, the number of retweeted tweets of National Executive Leader was significantly influenced by the total number of tweets. A Pearson correlation analysis conducted to investigate whether there was a relationship between the tweet retweeted and the tweet liked/favorited, found that there was a high correlation between tweet retweeted and tweets liked/favorited at 0.001 level of significance with (r=.918, p=.000). The positive correlation means that the followers who retweeted and liked/favorited the Tweets were the same. There is a likelihood that most followers like and retweet the Twitter post every time. Therefore, in this case National Leaders uses Twitter as a broadcast tool – because there were more retweets and likes of the post than replies.

Table 4. 11 A Pearson Correlation table of tweets liked and tweets retweeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of tweets liked/favorited</th>
<th>No. of tweet retweeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.918**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.3 Twitter Content Strategies of National Executive Leaders

According to Kent and Taylor (1998), the generation of return visits is an important principle because it unpacks the reason why audiences should return to an organization website and social media pages. It also demonstrates the capability to build a relationship between the organization and its audiences. Tables 12 and 13 show the findings of the research questions that tested the presence of generation of return visits principle. This principle was tested using the gained followers (this is a total number of followers accumulated by the National Executive Leaders between, July 1 2016 and September 30 2016) and the average tweets a day during the study period and the total tweets posted during the study period.

The study made use of Twitonomy (www.twitonomy.com), a free Twitter analytics website to simplify the process of scrolling through the Twitter timeline. The tool offers a flexible advanced search tool for finding tweets of a particular person over a given period of time and from one Twitter user to another. This tool was particularly useful in contextualizing the variables analyzed (Ssozi, 2016).

Table 4.12 Analysis of Return of visits principle using content posted by NELs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert’s Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 indicates that National Executive Leaders performed Below Average to appeal to new users at 42.9 per cent, 19 per cent performed Poorly, 14.3 per cent were at Average, 9.5 per cent Above Average, 4.8 per cent Below Excellent and 9.5 per cent at Excellent.
Table 4. 13 *Analysis of Gained Followers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1111</td>
<td>.33333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.9524</td>
<td>1.90987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 shows that a third of the National Executive Leaders performed below average on attracting new followers – nine out of 21 were at Below Average, while four National Executive Leaders have a Poor Rating. The Standard Deviation of Poor, Above Average, Excellent, Average ratings were similar while the Standard Deviation for Below Average was at 0.34.

Table 4. 14 *Chi Square analysis gained followers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>34.500a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>24.157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>11.708</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N of Valid Cases</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 18 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

Table 4.14 shows that the relationship between total average tweets a day and total tweets during the study is statistically significant since p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05 threshold. The appeal for the return of visitors was investigated through gained
followers during the period of the study. New followers on Twitter are attracted to content shared by the users they follow (Waters et al., 2011). Generation of return visits also shows the extent visitors are given incentives to return to social media pages over time. For this study, the ability of users to follow the National Executive Leaders, was highly contributed by regular updates on Twitter. National Executive Leaders with 401≥ tweets during the period gained more new followers, while those with 250 tweets gained fewer followers at 42.9 per cent. Nineteen percent of the National Executive Leaders performed Poorly, and had 1-100, tweets posted in their account during the study. Therefore, the return to visit was dependent on new content posted by National Executive Leaders on their Twitter accounts.

To further analyze the generation of return visits principle, the study sought to determine if there was a correlation between the gained followers and tweets posted during the study period. Thus, Table 4.14 established that majority (66.7 per cent) of the National Executive Leaders posted an average of 1-5 tweets a day and only 4.8 per cent of the Leaders posted 6-10 tweets a day. Therefore, the number of tweets during the study determined repeat visits to the Twitter handles of the National Executives.

Table 4. 15 Analysis of tweets during the period vs average tweets a day Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tweets during the study period</th>
<th>Average tweet a day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Pearson correlation test was carried out to examine the relationship between average tweets a day and total tweets during the study period. The study found a significant correlation at r=0.958, p=0.001). Therefore, this means that the principle of
return of visit was used less by the National Executive Leaders and that content strategy influenced the number of followers.

Table 4. 16 Average Tweet Per Day for a period of 3 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ave. Tweet Per Day for a period of 3 months</th>
<th>Analysis of tweet during the period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Tweet Per Day for a period of 3 months</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further analysis was conducted on a Likert’s scale to explore the frequency of the content shared or posted by the National Executive Leaders. Table 4.16 shows that National Executive Leaders who had tweets between 101-200, were classified as ‘mostly’ at 33.3 per cent, while the majority had 42.9 per cent of tweets classified ‘rarely’, meaning they posted 0-100 posts during the study period.

Table 4. 17 Likert’s scale on average daily tweets and study period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert’s scale for tweets</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 18 Average Tweet Per Day for a period of 3 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Tweet Per Day for a period of 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert’s scale for tweets at study period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The table shows that an average of nine National Executive Leaders rarely posted new tweets on their Twitter handles, while an average of one National Executive Leader always posted new information. The Standard Deviation of those that posted new content occasionally and rarely was relatively close at 0.7 and 0.5 respectively. In this case, the study found that content determined the generation of return visits and there was the least appeal to return of visits since there was inconsistency in posting of messages on Twitter accounts. These findings are consistent with Baumagarten, (2011), which indicated that the return to visits was the least used dialogic principle in their study of how U.S. non-profit organizations are using Twitter to foster dialogic communications. It also reflects Agozzino (2015) study on dialogic communication through pinning, which found that the generation of return had the lowest index score or less popular amongst the principle analyzed at 50%.

4.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the results and findings of the study. Findings are presented in frequency tables and graphs/figures. The presentation is aligned to the research questions and covers the adoption of Twitter by the National Executive Leaders, the content posted by National Executive leaders which are either governance related or non-governance related, how the National Executive measures the reach of their messages, and lastly the quality improvement strategies. Additionally, the chapter presents findings of the extent to which Twitter has been being adopted as a participatory and engagement tool by National Executive Leaders and whether the NE has embraced hashtags in their Twitter communications. The next chapter presents a discussion of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter represents a clear and concise summary, discussion, and interpretation of the study findings. The interpretation of the study guides the discussion, which leads to the establishment of key conclusions and recommendations for future application. It is imperative to comprehend that all these tasks are undertaken based on the data that was collected and analyzed to achieve the study objectives.

5.2 Summary

Twitter is an important communication tool as the study reveals. The aim of the study was to find out the utilization of Twitter by National Executive Leaders; to establish the extent to which the National Executive leaders have embraced Twitter content strategies; explore the type of information that National Executive Leaders post on Twitter, and the nature of interactions between National Executive Leaders and their followers.

The study established that 21 out of 23 National Executive Leaders have a presence on Twitter or they are using it as a communication platform. It further established that only 18 National Executive Leaders were active during the study period and posted content regularly. The extent of Twitter adoption for the National Executive Leaders is evidenced by the average number of followers, year joined, and the number of tweets as well as the number of new tweets during the study period. The study also established that 18% of the National Executive Leaders have profiles (Twitter profiles help the audience understand who you are) only on their Twitter accounts, while 81.1% have both profiles and web link (the weblinks were related to their ministries) in their
accounts. Twitter profiles are important on social media pages, because they describe who owns the account and who they are. When spiced up with a web link, the account implies that the owner takes the platform more seriously. In addition, Twitter profile and web links are similar to a website landing page. This validates Khan et al. (2014) study that had argued that Twitter accounts/profiles hereafter ‘accounts’ provide useful information on Twitter users’ interaction patterns, including the numbers of followers, followings, and tweets.

The study further found out that National Executive Leaders uses Twitter as a broadcast tool. This is evidenced by the number of tweets favorited and retweeted during the study period at 83.3 per cent. The findings show that National Executive Leaders use Twitter to share information related to government activities at 87.2 per cent, while 12.5 per cent share information unrelated to government activities, which was examined by the usefulness of information principle. The study found that the usefulness of information principle was in existence.

The interactions between National Executive Leaders and their followers (public) were investigated by use of three Twitter features, namely; reply, mentions and hashtags. The study found low levels of interactions, which was analyzed using the dialogic loop principle. The findings show that the nature of content posted determined if the owner of the account garnered new followers. Therefore, the content was a hook to appeal to new followers, further creating traffic to the Twitter pages. However, there was inconsistency in posting content on Twitter. This means most followers did not return to the page, because if you don’t post frequently, there is no new information. Therefore, the return to visit principle was not present.
5.3 Discussion

The study section provides an analysis of the three dialogic principles investigated during the study. Three Cabinet Secretaries; @cswillybett @HKRotich and @Cleophasmailu did not post any information on their Twitter handles during the study period. This shows lack of appreciation of the platform, considering that their ministries are the most critical in the country – Agriculture, National Treasury and Health respectively. For CS Mailu unavailability to share information on Twitter is odd, considering that during the study period there were several doctors’ strikes, while at the same period there were various discussions on Food Security – which falls in the Ministry of Agriculture.

5.3.1 Dialogic loop principle

The fundamental principle of using social media appropriately in an organization is to create an appealing conversation with the audiences that your institution serves. The study findings indicate that while National Executive Leaders are taking some steps to create dialogues and initiate online conversations that raise awareness of government activities to online communities, these leaders are not fully utilizing the Twitter features; particularly replies. This study supports previous findings that organizations are not effectively implementing all five dialogic principles online (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009). The study found out that National Executive Leaders vary in their ability to utilizing dialogic loop principles. The study found out that there were low interactions between National Executive Leader and their followers. The investigation of interactions that combined all replies, mentions, and hashtags features using a Likert’s scale found that majority of National Executive Leaders had low interactions with their followers at 66.7 per cent, while only 1.9 per cent of the understudy had highest interactions with their followers, 14.8 per cent had average
interactions. The results also mirror the conclusion of Agozzino (2015) environmental advocacy groups’ use of Facebook pages to determine the dialogic strategies at work on advocacy groups’ profile, which revealed that the advocacy group were not utilizing the dialogic loop strategies or generation of return visits. In addition, the finding reflects Water et al.’s (2011) study that shown the weakest areas of dialogic principles were among the health centres social media communications was the dialogic loop and the generation of return visits.

Of the three features examined on interactions, hashtags were the ‘mostly’ used form of interaction, further supporting, Tully and Ekadale (2014) study on the use of hashtags in Kenya. The authors revealed that hashtags in Kenya, create spaces that facilitate a rapid back-and-forth style of communication in which users can endorse the contributions of others through retweets, respond to each other’s statements through replies, or add a new dimension to the conversation by tagging tweets that are humorous, angry, calculated, or absurd. The same authors, further revealed that through the use of hashtags, Kenyans on Twitter unite against self-bestowed pay raises by Members of Parliament, respond to media misrepresentations of their country, and engage in discussions about Kenya’s national identity and global position. Through humor and serious critique, participants in these sites of playful engagement challenge inequality and push development agendas forward.

Therefore, online citizen interactions with National Executive Leaders were mostly in the form of comments made after a tweet. Even though the leader attempted to connect with the online citizens, the results are somewhat discouraging that not many comments were responded to. The result also implied that National Executive Leaders were unwilling to respond to online citizens’. To achieve a two-way communication,
more responses should be given by the National Executive Leaders through replies or
direct messages rather than relying on hashtags or mentions. Finally, National
Executive Leaders do not use Twitter as a conversational platform.

5.3.2 Usefulness of information

The study findings indicate that National Executive Leaders are using Twitter to
share information with their online citizens related to government activities. Such
information creates awareness about government activities amongst the audiences while
at the same time building a relationship with them. More specifically, 87.5 per cent of
the National Executive Leaders shared government related information, while 12.5 per
cent shared non-government related information. Out of 3,223 tweets, there were 1,740
tweets (53.99 per cent) which contained announcement variables in total, event formal
had 866 tweets (26.87 per cent) in total, political tweets were 238 (7.38 per cent) in
total, diplomacy tweets were 171 (5.31 per cent) in total, feedback tweets were 137
(4.25 per cent) in total, event informal tweets were 66 (2.05 per cent) while appointment
tweets were only five (0.16 per cent). Thus, the usefulness of information principle was
apparent in the National Executive Leaders tweets. This finding confirms observations
from Water et al.’s (2011) study which revealed that the strongest areas of dialogic
principles were the provision of useful information and conservation of visitors. This
study’s findings further mirror Agozzino’s (2015) analysis of top 10 most followed
organizations’ Pinterest profiles study that revealed the usefulness of information
principle was the highest dialogic principle at 84 per cent, the second highest principle –
dialogic loop – had an index score of 75 per cent. Additionally, conservation of visitors
had an index score of 73 per cent, while the generation of return visits had the lowest
index score of 50 per cent.
Government related information dominated the posts of most of these leaders. The information posted was liked and retweeted, indicating that the National Executive Leaders utilized Twitter as a broadcast tool, further supporting (Ssozi, 2015) study that argued that favorites and retweets don’t directly contribute to a conversation. Ssozi (2015) stated that Twitter becomes a broadcast tool, where the primary objective of a given user is to retweet opinions or thoughts that interest him or her with the aim of spreading the message far and wide; paying very little or no attention to replies addressed to them or conversation initiated by other users.

The need to share the information is motivated by the need to communicate and clarify government policies and activities to the public. The use of Twitter by Governments is not something new according to (Khan et al., 2014). Kenya has joined the US, the UK, Australia and many other nations in appreciating the effective role of Twitter in communicating with citizens. This finding, further echoes the outcome of the study done by Alam and Lucas (2011) who determined that the Australian government relies on Twitter to reach a wide audience, communicate government policies and information about government formal events. Based on the coded tweets, this study supported Park et al., (2016) who presented the major roles Twitter plays in government. The four roles were extending the reach of communications, updating and sharing information, building relationships, and collaborating with stakeholders. This study supported two of the roles suggested by Park et al. (2016), which were extending the reach of communications and updating and sharing information. The study found that National Executive Leaders use Twitter to disseminate information and activities related to government. According to Khasawneh and Abu-Shanab (2013), social media is an effective medium of communication because it allows two-way communication flow. Simon et al. (2014) echo the same findings in a study that examined the use of
Twitter in Kenya. It seems the same spirit of sharing information, inspired the National Executive Leaders to share non-government related information that is neutral issues, personal views, and government related information. These findings further, validates Straus et al’s., (2013) study on the adoption of Twitter in the 111th US Congress that found out that House Members’ and Senate’s decision to register Twitter accounts were driven by their desire to deliver their message to a wider audience. The study shows that the nature of interactions was limited to retweets and likes of tweet messages. This validates Alam and Lucas’ (2011) study that examined the use of Twitter by the Australian government. In their study, they examined the use of Twitter by government agencies and the interaction with the citizens. They found out that government agencies use tweets to disseminate and broadcast news, provide updates about their work, and provide information about their events. Therefore, it is clear that leaders are using Twitter, and it would be foolish to miss an opportunity of reaching out to the citizen. These outcomes validate Tomaseli and Sundar’s (2011) study that Twitter is extensively used for social conversations, with 81 per cent of African users using it to converse with friends. The study reveals that Kenyans rely on Leaders’ Twitter accounts to obtain information at no cost. Finally, the data obtained demonstrate that National Executive Leaders have not adopted Twitter as a platform for propaganda, but rather to communicate or connect with the citizens.

5.3.3 Generation of return visits

The present study was also guided by an attempt to understand if the National Executive Leaders employ content strategies to generate the return of visitors to their Twitter accounts. The findings in this research indicate that the generation of return visits was the weakest principle because most National Executive Leaders infrequently posted new content on their pages. A Pearson correlation found a significant relation
between new followers and total tweets during the study. Thus, followers or online communities follow National Executive Leaders because they want to be informed. For example, the President and Deputy President’s Twitter pages garnered 510 and 460 new followers, because they post new information at least six times a day. National Executive Leaders who had between 101-200 tweets were categorized as ‘mostly’ at 33.3 per cent, while a large number of National Executive Leaders had 42.9 per cent of tweets categorized as rarely’, meaning they posted 0-100 tweets during the study period. Therefore, the more times a leader posts new content the higher their chances of increasing the number of followers. This concurs with Waters et al.’s (2011) position that the generation of return visits was the weakest principle and was perceived as the most difficult to implement effectively. This was further supported by Bortree & Seltzer, (2009), Seltzer & Mitrook, (2007) and Taylor & Kent, (2004). Martin et al. (2015), found out that no city in the European Union made use of the principle of generating visitors. Therefore, this validates Leone et al. (2013) study on Twitter use by Italian ministries and government department examined to what extent was Twitter was used to facilitate a participatory approach through new content. The study found that the majority of the organizations studied showed a low appreciation of content.

5.4 Conclusions

The application of dialogic principles in social networks is still underutilized. This is because most of the content posted is aimed at creating awareness and minimum conversations. In public administration, the use of these principles can produce significant benefits since social networks in themselves favor relations between the government and the online communities. The theory of dialogic communication makes it possible to study how governments use Twitter as a broadcast and conversational tool.
The study found that 21 out of 23 National Executive Leaders had Twitter handles. Moreover, those that do, obtain only one benefit of using the platform. The main reason for joining Twitter is to establish an online relationship with online communities (Ssozi, 2016). So far, the National Executive Leaders have established a presence on Twitter but their conversation with the followers is low as the findings show. Therefore, the leaders need to be trained in communications theories. If the leaders are trained, the use of Twitter as a communication platform will improve. Clearly, these results are open to improvement, because governments are mostly unaware of this theory, and future awareness represents an opportunity for them to improve their relationships with citizens.

On the dialogic principles analyzed here, we stress the importance of the dialogic loop principle in government communications; this plays a key role in enhancing public participation and favors the emergence of relations based on dialogue and interactions with the population. However, the findings show that this principle is currently not fully utilized in dialogic communication strategies, and therefore, many National Executive Leaders are failing to obtain the considerable benefits and potential offered by the Twitter application for their relationships with online communities. On the other hand, the subtopic reflecting information of interest to online audience shows that leaders, through their Twitter profiles, should improve or work harder to provide more information to their online communities in order to generate return visits. According to the results of our analysis, National Executive Leaders need to improve some of their online communication strategies, especially in the following respects, introducing a policy to generate value-added content in multiple formats (images, videos and others); applying policies to encourage user interaction and achieving a stronger linkage between the government’s social networks platforms and its website.
To achieve these goals, online relationships must be made more professional, and an appropriate approach in this respect would be to recruit a Community Manager, to be responsible for energizing online relationships between National Executive Leaders and online audiences, channeling their demands and managing the information that is to be published.

The findings of the study confirm that National Executive Leaders use Twitter as a broadcast tool rather than for conversation. It also confirms that the understudy uses the platform to share information related to government and not propaganda. In addition, National Executive Leaders do not have content strategies, hence are not able to generate returns in their pages. The leaders see Twitter as the fastest way to reach many people within a very short time. National Executive Leaders have embraced the use of hashtags to increase tweet visibility is common as confirmed by the study findings. The Kenyan National Executive is among the few governments in Africa that are starting to embrace the use of social media to communicate and engage citizens.

The government has embraced Twitter as an effective communication medium to the point of preparing guidelines that allow top officials to hire people who focus on the use of social media platforms to communicate to members of the public. In summary, the results of this study extend our understanding of dialogic principles applied by National Executive Leaders on Twitter.

5.5 Study Limitations

This study had two limitations. First, our analysis is based on a textual analysis of Twitter posts. While this approach is useful in elucidating how technological differences between the older and newer forms of communication technologies have impacted government communication, this study is not able to ascertain motivations, which guide National Executive Leaders to use of the Twitter. Linked to this limitation
is the researcher inability to measure the authenticity of the government’s responsiveness to the needs of its citizens when using twitter to communicate.

5.6 Recommendations for Policy and Practice

I. In order to analyze whether National Executive Leaders fully understand Twitter features, there is a need to interview all the leaders, because it seems their PR departments are charged with posting information on their behalf. This is because the ministry and cabinet secretaries accounts had related information.

II. The CAK a regulatory body in charge of communication in Kenya, needs to step up its effort to increase the rate of internet penetration across the country, especially in rural areas and major towns. At the same time, it must reduce the cost of internet connection which is a deterrent to the use of the medium.

III. The relevant authorities must monitor Twitter which has become a breeding ground for hate speech where people are defamed, inflammatory remarks are made and propaganda is continuously spread especially during the election campaign period.

IV. The government needs to adopt Twitter in providing some of its services to the public given the wide reach of the platform and its ability to send messages instantly.

V. Since the study targeted only the National Executive Leaders, a similar study can be done on other levels of government such as Principal Secretaries, Governors, Senators, Member of Parliaments and Ministries.

VI. Considering that this study was conducted when Twitter had only 140 characters, a similar study can be done now that Twitter has 280 characters per tweet.

VII. Given the period that this study was conducted a year to the general elections a
similar study can be done after the election campaign window when new appointments have been made.

5.7 Recommendations for Further Studies

For future research, scholars can analyze whether content on National Executive Leaders Twitter pages cause their followers to respond or react to that content. The communication style such as the tone of National Executive Leaders on Twitter pages can also be an avenue of further research to determine which styles of communication they prefer to communicate messages on.

It would also be important to investigate the National Leaders use of other social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, Blogs, and YouTube.

Further work involving interviews with National Executive Leader and citizens who use these technologies for citizen-government communication will provide greater insights into the effectiveness of web 2.0 technologies on policy development.
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Appendix C – Research Tools: Coding Book Analysis

Section 1: Adoption
Year Joined
Number of follower’s
Total number of tweets this account posts
Number of new tweets
Do national executives have profiles, web-links or blogs…….

Section 2 Content type:
1) Government Related Updates_____________
   - Diplomacy
   - Appointment
   - Announcement
   - Political
   - Events
     - Formal
     - Informal
2) Non-Governmental Updates_____________

Section 3. Interactions
(a) Type of engagement – (I) Likes, (II) retweet (iii) mentions (iv) replies (v) hashtags

Section 4. Visits returns
(a) Total gained followers during the study period, and average tweets posted daily during the study period
## Appendix D – Leaders’ Twitter Presence Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ministry/Department</th>
<th>Twitter Handle</th>
<th>Year of Joining Twitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adan Mohamed</td>
<td>Industrialization</td>
<td>@AdanMohamedCS</td>
<td>Aug-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amb Amina Mohamed</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>@AMB_A_Mohammed</td>
<td>Apr-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Keter</td>
<td>Energy &amp; Petroleum</td>
<td>@ketercharles</td>
<td>Oct-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopa Kilonzo Mailu</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>@Cleophasmaalu</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kansanga</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>@HonDanKansanga</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Fred Okengo Matangi</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>@FredMatiangi</td>
<td>Apr-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hassan Wario Arero</td>
<td>Sports, Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>@AeroWario</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Wamalwa</td>
<td>Water &amp; Irrigation</td>
<td>@EugeneWamalwa</td>
<td>May-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (Rtd)Joseph K Nkaissery</td>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>@GenNkaissery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Githu Muigai</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>@Githumuigai</td>
<td>Sept-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry K Rotich</td>
<td>Finance &amp; National Treasury</td>
<td>@HKRotich</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Macharia</td>
<td>Transport &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>@JamesMacharia</td>
<td>Mar-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Mucheru</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>@mucheru</td>
<td>Feb-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwangi Kiunjuri</td>
<td>Devolution &amp; Planning</td>
<td>@CS_Kunjuri</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najib Balala</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>@najibus</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis J K Kandie</td>
<td>Labour &amp; EAC Affairs</td>
<td>@Kandie_Phyllis</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Jacob T Kaimenyi</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>@Kaimenyi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Judi W Wakhungu</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>@JudiWakhungu</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily Kanini Kariuki</td>
<td>Public Service, Youth &amp; Gender Affairs</td>
<td>@SicilyKariuki</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhuru Kenyatta</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>@Ukenyatta</td>
<td>Aug-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ruto</td>
<td>Deputy President</td>
<td>@WilliamsRuto</td>
<td>July-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy Bett</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>@cswillybett</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E – Schedule of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Dec 9th, 2016</th>
<th>Dec 15th, 2016</th>
<th>Feb-March</th>
<th>April 2017</th>
<th>May to October 2017</th>
<th>December 2017</th>
<th>September 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing and preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F – Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>TOTAL (KES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>1@2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel costs</td>
<td>4@1,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistants</td>
<td>4@2,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology costs</td>
<td>1@50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix G – Analysed Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twitter Handle</th>
<th>Profile/Web/Inks/Blog</th>
<th>Year joined</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Protected</th>
<th>Total No. of Followers</th>
<th>Total No. of Tweets</th>
<th>Gained Followers during the study period</th>
<th>New Tweets for a period of 5 months</th>
<th>Ave. Tweet Per Day for a period of 3 months</th>
<th>Tweet with Links during the study</th>
<th>List Followers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kazungu</td>
<td>@CS_dankazungu</td>
<td>Feb 3rd 2016</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Jack W Wachanga</td>
<td>@JackWWachanga</td>
<td>Aug 14th 2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>99749</td>
<td>7088</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Wamalwa</td>
<td>@EugeneLWamalwa</td>
<td>May 2nd 2012</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36382</td>
<td>2357</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry K Rotich</td>
<td>@HKRotich</td>
<td>Dec 6th 2013</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8544</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bt Basani Wako Arivo</td>
<td>@BtBasaniWakoArivo</td>
<td>June 15 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24060</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Fred Okengo Matangi</td>
<td>@FredMatangi</td>
<td>Apr 25 2013</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59826</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Macharia</td>
<td>@JamesMacharia</td>
<td>Mar 15 2012</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20554</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy Bett</td>
<td>@willybett</td>
<td>Feb 3rd 2016</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen:Rtd:Joseph K Nkainsery</td>
<td>@GenNkainsery</td>
<td>Jan 20th 2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15486</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amb Amina Mohamed</td>
<td>@AMR_A_Mohamed</td>
<td>April 25th 2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>311423</td>
<td>6498</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silky Kansi Kariuki</td>
<td>@SilkyKariuki</td>
<td>Feb 2nd 2016</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7278</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najib Malala</td>
<td>@Injiafrica</td>
<td>Feb 20th 2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>151473</td>
<td>3084</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheko Keter</td>
<td>@kiterkenso</td>
<td>Dec 9th 2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28616</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phile Ke K Karale</td>
<td>@KaziKe_Philke</td>
<td>June 25th 2014</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25835</td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adan Mohamed</td>
<td>@AdanMohamed</td>
<td>Aug 1st 2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>82340</td>
<td>3708</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Macharia</td>
<td>@josemacharia</td>
<td>Feb 27th 2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10398</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Cleopas Kibera Muasa</td>
<td>@CleopasKiberaMuasa</td>
<td>Jan 25th 2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwangi Kunga</td>
<td>@Cw_Kunga</td>
<td>Feb 22nd 2016</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3079</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathu Mugai</td>
<td>@Gilhannugai</td>
<td>Sept 4th 2011</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okera Kenyatta</td>
<td>@KenYatta</td>
<td>Aug 20th 2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>284255</td>
<td>9772</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Roti</td>
<td>@WilliamRoti</td>
<td>July 12th 2011</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1143428</td>
<td>4901</td>
<td>11708</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kazungu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Jahl W Wakahungu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Wamalwa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry K Rotich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hassan Wario Arero</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Fred Okango Matiangi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Macharia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy Ruto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (Rtd) Joseph K Nkaissery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amb Anna Mohamed</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily Kenneth Karuiki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najib Balala</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Keter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelel T K Kariuki</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Mohamed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Maitho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Cleopas Kihoro Muki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shwargi Kimumuni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Califa Mungai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kioko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ruto</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter Handle</td>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>Mentions</td>
<td>Hashtags</td>
<td>No. of tweets liked/favoured</td>
<td>Total number of tweets</td>
<td>No. of tweet retweeted</td>
<td>Total number of tweets Retweeted</td>
<td>Most mentioned users on tweets</td>
<td>Popular Hashtags</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@CSHexKazungu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>madinikenya</td>
<td>MiningKs-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@JudiWahungu</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Environment, Kz</td>
<td>Has2016-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@EngWRamaswa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3366</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2894</td>
<td>SugarFred and NIBKenya</td>
<td>Macrolepsis_elaboration-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@HealthMoH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ARooneyWario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Musakannya</td>
<td>ReadValue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@FredMatiangi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NTVKenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@JamesMacharia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>WilliamRuto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@cswillybett</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@GenNkaissery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>KaranjaKibichu</td>
<td>Gold-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ASIB_A_Mohammed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>17090</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9891</td>
<td>Ukenyatta</td>
<td>UCTAd-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@SicilyKaruki</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Ukenyatta</td>
<td>UNGA-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@K24TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>41757</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>Kejriwal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@AdanMohamedCS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7258</td>
<td>MohammedMustafa</td>
<td>UCTAd-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@cswillybett</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Mucheru</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>JumaGreening</td>
<td>Rollingmonth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@CSKiongoz</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>K24TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ChepheniKvasi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@CSHexKazungu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>K24TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@GathiriMungai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>MedOnline</td>
<td>Gossipkiker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@K24TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>4779</td>
<td>NuaNuaDrMedvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@CSKiongoz</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>68080</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>48356</td>
<td>KC4TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Section 4: Type of Engagement |                  |                  |
|--------------------------------|------------------|

81