Słowo, Tekst, Czas XIII

Frazeologia w dyskursie i przekładzie

Pod redakcją Mirosławy Hordy

Szczecin 2020

Fotografia na okładce: Mirosława Hordy – Jasne Błonia, Szczecin

Spis treści

Rozdział I – Szkoła frazeologiczna Profesora Michaiła Aleksiejenki

Rozdział II – Idiomatyczność, frazeologiczność i gatunki mowy

Rozdział III – Jednostki frazeologiczne w dyskursach

Rozdział IV – Język i strategie komunikacyjne dyskursów medialnych

Rozdział V – Problemy przekładu jednostek frazeologicznych i nazw własnych

Krzysztof Flasiński
Uniwersytet Szczeciński, Polska

Communication of Transport for London conducted in social media during the London Underground industrial action

The major industrial action in the London Underground (LU) commenced at 6 p.m. on 8 July 2015. The protest lasted 24 hours. All lines and stations of the LU were closed for the first time in 13 years. Journalists called that protest 'the most severe disruption to the tube network since 2002' (Brooks-Pollock 2015) and the 'worst disruption for 13 years' (Khomami, Gani, Tran, Ratcliffe 2015). The campaign was organised by 4 unions representing 20 thousand employees (Topham 2015) and began with the announcement of stopping the night services on five London Underground lines on Fridays and Saturdays.

The industrial action has a significant impact on the urban environment and a life quality of the capital inhabitants. The LU indicator 'Total Lost Customer Hours' equalled 4 923 000 hours in the period between 28 June 2015 and 25 July 2015; in comparison, it was 1 432 000 hours in the same period in 2014 (TfL 2015: 15). Despite the increased number of buses, overground trains, and even bicycles there were serious delays and overcrowding. The media called this industrial action 'The Tube strike' and published information on special initiatives, actions, and discounts provided by restaurants (Lloyd 2015) and hotels (Pemberton 2015). This involvement of the local and nationwide media proves the protest importance for the London society.

The underground in London was founded in 1863 and since then has been an important component of the urban transport system. The LU is managed by the Transport for London (TfL). The TfL undertakes an extensive communication in new media, in particular, in the social media. The basic communication platform is the website (www.tfl.gov.uk) with the official weblog (blog.tfl.gov.uk); the first entry was published on 16 July 2013. The organisation conducted the most expanded action on popular services, namely Facebook and Twitter. There are 3 official Facebook pages and 24 Twitter accounts; 5 of them provide general information and 19 are related to specific services.

In practical perspective, the industrial action had significant implications on the online communication. There were 3,804,796 visits on the TfL official site during the strike period; according to the TfL data, the standard level for two days is 1,501,908 (Irvine 2015). In social media, hashtag – 'keyword proceeded by the # sign' (Marwick, Boyd 2010: 121) and used for linking to the group of status updates marked by the same hashtag – 'tubestrike' was mentioned approximately 100,000 times (www.topsy.com, data collected on 12.07.2015).

This users' behaviour was a consequence of two main factors. Firstly, the transit is one of the most popular subjects in social media and the transit-related information is published on all SNS channels (Gal-Tzur et al. 2014: 116). Secondly, London inhabitants are actively involved in social media communication. London was on seventh position regarding the number of georeferenced tweets in 2012 (Leetaru 2013).

In theoretical perspective, the social media communication is an important field of the academic studies across many disciplines (Khang, Ki, Ye 2012: 290). Researchers proved that involving users with social network sites (SNS) became an essential part of the image creation in the web 2.0 era. Both trends, the SNS (Boyd, Ellison 2007: 211) and the web 2.0 (O'Reilly 2005), are based on publishing of interactive content (Kaczmarek-Śliwińska 2013: 47–48) and collaborative 'with' and 'between' audiences. The digital communication provides different, new opportunities for communication with customers (Mulhern 2009: 99) and the significance of social media in the PR activities increases (Wright, Hinson 2014: 22–24).

An extensive overview of the social media usage, during transport crisis situations, was provided by B. Pender, G. Currie, A. Delbosc and N. Shiwakoti (2014). Authors highlighted that usage of social media during unplanned service disruptions is 'invaluable' (p. 517). Likewise, research of S. Bregman showed a significant function of the SNS in communication activities of transport agencies in the USA. According to this study, 'Responding agencies considered social media "very effective" in accomplishing the following: communicating with current riders (58% of reporting agencies), distributing real-time information (43%), distributing general service information (42%)' (Bregman 2012: 39). Authors of research *Tweeting transport: examining the use of Twitter in transport events* described the Twitter communication during the 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow, Scotland. They applied the following categories of transport-related status updates: disruption, general travel information, entertainment, general information, alternative transport options, information seeking, specific reply (Cottrill et al. 2015: 6) and found a high degree of sharing of information related to the transport system disruptions (p.10).

As mentioned above, both elements, communication in social media and urban transport, are related to and important in theoretical and practical perspective. Therefore, in the context of serious transport service disruptions in London this research seeks to address the three following questions:

> RQ1: Is organisation *modus operandi* on SNS during the strike action different from activity in the normal period?
> RQ2: How was the subject of the industrial action in the London Underground presented on TfL SNS channels?
> RQ3: Did publications, related to the transport disruptions, affect users' engagement model?

To answer these questions, a content analysis was adopted to gain a detailed understanding of the SNS communication during the industrial action. Three publication sources were chosen: an official brand Facebook page (F-TfL), an official organisation Twitter account

@TfL (T-TfL) and the Twitter channel @TlfTravelAlerts used for real-time communication (T-TTA). The examination covered a week-period 6–12 July 2015. For the purposes of comparison, week 5–11 October 2015 was chosen as a control period without major interruptions in the urban transport.

Based on the pilot survey random sampling was abandoned. All entries published on 3 above-described sources were analysed. The study sample contained 14 entries on F-TfL (included 5 related to the industrial action), 85 status updates on T-TfL (58 on the protest), and 781 status updates on T-TTA (551 on the action). The control sample included 13 posts on F-TfL, 74 publications on T-TfL, and 193 status updates on T-TTA.

This paper has been divided into three main parts. The first section of this paper examines the protest's impact on the TfL communication in the SNS including quantity indicators of actions undertaken by the organisation. The second part contains a detailed analysis of publications related to industrial action on Facebook and Twitter. The third section presents the findings of the research, focusing on users' activities. Finally, conclusions and answers to the research questions are provided in the last part of this study.

Impact of the industrial action on organisation communication in the SNS

Data in Table 1 show the increase in the brand activity on Twitter in the period of the industrial action. This is particularly apparent on the profile T-TTA (the number of status updates increased by 588, 304.66%). The difference to the control period data on Facebook page was not significant.

Table 1. TfL activity on Facebook and Twitter on 6–12.07.2015 and 5–11.10.2015

date	F-TfL			T-TfL			T-TTA		
	prim.	re.	Σ	prim.	re.	Σ	prim.	re.	Σ
6.07	4	0	4	5	0	5	16	97	113
7.07	2	0	2	6	0	6	18	87	105
8.07	2	0	2	27	0	27	57	233	290
9.07	3	0	3	25	0	25	31	126	157
10.07	1	0	1	9	0	9	15	31	46
11.07	2	0	2	10	0	10	30	20	50
12.07	0	0	0	3	0	3	9	11	20
Σ 6–12.07	14	0	14	85	0	85	176	605	781
Σ 5–11.10	13	0	13	74	0	74	70	123	193

prim.: moderator's primary entries
re.: moderator's responses to questions and comments submitted by users

Source: Based on one's own research results.

The increased activity on Twitter occurred in particular during the strike action between 8 and 9 July, and in the days prior to the event. On Facebook page, there was no increase

in the total number of publications. Moreover, most of the entries on the F-TfL appeared on Monday 6 July, and none of them contained references to the upcoming strike action.

Despite the varied activity of the administrator, the balance between primary entries and responses was retained. Likewise, in the control period, responses were not published on the F-TfL and the T-TFL. Communication on the T-TTA was conducted differently; the majority of publications (605, 77.47%) were responses to users' questions. During the control period, this indicator was 63.73%.

The absence of conversations on the F-TfL and the T-TfL was not caused by the organisation ignoring its users. The consistency of both results, the analysis and the control period, shows a retaining *modus operandi* on conducting a dialogue with the users. The F-TfL and the T-TfL were established as channels to publishing original content. The users were engaged in dialogue throughout the T-TTA. The answers to the questions and comments submitted by users were also provided on other specialised Twitter profiles covering, for instance, payment for transport (www.twitter.com/TfLWaystoPay), accessibility for persons with disabilities (www.twitter.com/tflaccess) and connections provided by the London Buses (www.twitter.com/TfLBusAlerts).

However, the organisation abandoned the publication of multimedia attachments in the period of the strike. This decision was particularly relevant in the case of Facebook, where attaching graphics, photography and video to entries are common and expected by the audience activity. Analysis of the F-TfL suggests that providing an engaging, visual content is also a feature of the TfL Facebook page and multimedia publications involved the audience in the most efficient manner; for example, a video on the safety of pedestrians on the streets (like: 3342, share: 474, comment: 108; 15.07.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/videos/923624167694393), graphic illustrating the safety of cyclists (like: 2269, share: 690, comment: 350; 22.07.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/posts/923678831022260), panoramic pictures of London taken from the deck of boat TfL River Bus (like: 10264, share: 1414, comment: 165; 01.08.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/photos/a.231642850225865.59681.212038972186253/949843231739153). Nonetheless, none of the entries about the industrial action contains multimedia.

Cancellation of sharing graphical content was used to emphasise the informative features of publication in the SNS. This function was highlighted by adding Internet addresses to two TfL websites: information about additional communication services (www.tfl.gov.uk/tube-strike) and statements by Mike Brown, Managing Director of the London Underground, on reasons for the strike, as well as on the conduct of the negotiations and proposals[1].

Likewise, the informative function of communication during the crisis was accented by the mode of publications on the industrial action. The data on this subject will be presented and discussed in the following section of this paper.

---

1 www.tfl.gov.uk/campaign/message-to-london-from-mike-bro

Industrial action as the main subject of communication on the SNS

The Strike of the London Underground personnel was the primary subject of publication on the TfL channels on the SNS, mainly during the industrial action. The average percentage of strike-subject entries on 8–9 July was similar and amounted to 75% on F-TfL, 100% on T-TfL and 84.65% on T-TTA. However, according to data provided in Table 2, saturation of content on this subject was not uniform on all analysed accounts.

Table 2. Saturation of content thematically related to the industrial action on the TfL SNS accounts on 6–12.07.2015

date	F-TfL		T-TfL		T-TTA	
	numerically	percentage	numerically	percentage	numerically	percentage
6.07	0	0.00	0	0.00	79	69.91
7.07	1	50.00	5	83.33	74	70.48
8.07	1	50.00	27	100.00	249	85.86
9.07	3	100.00	25	100.00	131	83.44
10.07	0	0.00	1	11.11	18	39.13
11.07	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
12.07	0	—	0	0.00	0	0.00
Σ 6–12.07	5	35.71	58	68.24	551	70.55

Source: Based on one's own research results.

The lowest appearance of entries thematically related to the strike was found on the TfL Facebook page. Meanwhile, on both Twitter accounts saturation was at a similar level and reached the highest values. High percentage results on the T-TTA, on days preceding and following the industrial action, indicates a strong emphasis on providing early warnings of threats to the transport system.

A more detailed analysis of the entries confirms that the majority of the strike-related publications were informative. Most of the publications aimed at informing users about the impending problems or the current situation in the transport system (F-TfL: 2, T-TfL: 39, T-TTA: 541). The second group includes publications which contain an explanation of the reasons for the industrial action and the progress of talks between the leadership of the TfL and the representatives of the trade unions (F-TfL: 2, T-TfL: 17, T-TTA: 10). The smallest group consists of entries which do not comprise of any specific information, and only mention thanks for patience and apologies for the inconveniences addressed to the users of the London Underground (F-TfL: 1, T-TfL: 2, T-TTA: 0). These groups of publications will be discussed below.

Topics of the informative entries were correlated with current events: warnings of inconveniences, associated with the strike action, which dominated during the protest; answers to questions about alternative transport services for passengers and, with an equal frequency, the planned date of the recommencement of the London Underground's infrastructure.

Initially, the organisation stressed the possibility of transport problems during the action. This technique allowed the TfL, to do both: inform users about the upcoming inconveniences and draw attention to the efforts of problem resolution. Such a procedure was applied on all TfL accounts on the SNS. For example, the entry shared the day before the strike on the F-TfL: 'If strike action goes ahead there will be no Tube services from around 18:00 on Wednesday and no services on Thursday. We have a range of measures to keep London moving, however, all public transport and roads will be much busier than usual, in particular during peak hours. Customers are advised to check before they travel at www.tfl.gov.uk/tube-strike' (7.07.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/posts/928350503888426). The progress of the negotiations or the causes of the strike were not presented in this publication. The text quoted above was designed to warn users of the inconveniences and draw their attention to the actions undertaken by the TfL to minimise the strike effects. Similar phrases were also found in status updates on Twitter; nonetheless, generally, it appeared as answers to users' questions, for instance, 'If the strike goes ahead, there will be no Tube service from late afternoon on Wednesday 8 July' (06.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfLTravelAlerts/status/618006474485317632).

In response to the union's decision to strike, the moderators recommended not relying on public transport in London after 6 p.m. on 8 July. This information was limited to general advice. Moreover, when answering users' questions, the organisation emphasised that accurate information could not have been provided at that time and that the situation was caused by the extent of the industrial action. Moreover, inconveniences difficult to predict in the entire urban transport system were hinted at, for example, 'Sorry we can't be more specific but I would strongly suggest you finish your journey by 18:00' (8.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfLTravelAlerts/status/618787616633323520) and 'We are advising people to complete their journey by 6pm if possible' (8.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfLTravelAlerts/status/618817043148746754).

Status updates published on 8 and 9 July were similar in the structure and the content. They provided information on alternative travel routes, warnings of the increased traffic and reference to the website with enhanced information about the transport system of London, for instance, 'Tube services are expected to resume tomorrow morning. Route 68 bus goes to Euston. Please see http://ow.ly/PoRHr' (9.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfLTravelAlerts/status/619206100320186368) and 'London Overground are not striking but services are expected to be busier than usual' (8.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfLTravelAlerts/status/618764631226646528).

The above-mentioned change in the use of the form and the content of the entries in the social media can be understood as a symptom of the modification of the communication strategy. Useful information was delivered depending on users' demands and according to the current situation. A similar organisational behaviour was found in the second group of entries, discussed in the following section. A further significant group comprises of entries containing an explanation of the reasons for the industrial action and the progress in negotiations between the leadership of the TfL and the representatives of the trade unions. As mentioned above, most of those publications appeared in the official profile of the T-TfL.

However, due to the nature of Facebook, the statements of the organisation were more fully showed in publications on the F-TfL.

The entries in this group contained three main subjects. First, the legitimacy of providing night-time services in the London Underground on Friday and Saturday was described with an emphasis on specific needs of London residents, for example, 'London is increasingly a 24 hour city; the Tube is now just as busy late at night as it is in the peak hours during the day. That's why we're introducing the Night Tube' (8.07.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/posts/928699260520217). Second, the lack of the legitimacy of starting the protest was mentioned in relation to significant possible inconveniences and worsening of working conditions, for instance, 'Planned Tube strike action is unnecessary & will cause big disruption to the people & economy of London' (8.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfL/status/618536186974478336) and 'For most of our staff, #NightTube will only mean a few extra nights per year. Striking is unnecessary' (8.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfL/status/618747811618770944). Third, the progress of the collective bargaining with the representatives of the trade unions was described with an emphasis on the TfL goodwill and partner's benevolence in negotiations, for example, 'We've strained every muscle to put together a fair pay offer for our staff' (8.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfL/status/618823336907243520).

The moderators introduced an explicit differentiation between the organisation approach to the negotiations and the representatives of the trade unions' statement and between the union representatives and the employees of the London Underground. Contrasting terms were used post in this group. For example, 'We've been completely transparent' and 'little constructive engagement on their part' (9.07.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/posts/929196570470486), and in the same entry, 'We've strained every muscle to put together a remarkably fair pay offer' and 'But the leaderships of the unions have refused to respond to this offer' or 'Unions have refused to respond to our increased offer & have refused to put it to their members' (8.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfL/status/618881102812454912).

It is significant to notice the division used by the organisation to describe the participants of the dialogue. The technique outlined in the previous paragraph can be rather defined as a differentiation than distinction or division. Expressions like 'we' (TfL) and 'them' (representatives of the trade unions) were found in the TfL publications. However, an explicit promotion of mutual values and interests of the community, as well as organisation, commuters and the London Underground employees were also mentioned. This type of an image creation on the SNS corresponded with the restraint of publications bias found in the data discussed below.

The third group of entries contained thanks and apologies addressed to London Underground users and, as indicated above, was the least numerous. Three status updates were published on the F-TfL and the T-TfL simultaneously in early afternoon on the second day of the protest and in the morning on the day after the strike. All publications included phrase 'Thanks for your patience' (9.07.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/posts/929284703795006; 9.07.2015: www.twitter.com/tfl/status/619120172402634752; 10.07.2015: www.twitter.com/tfl/status/619375148035084290); therefore, messages were

specifically directed to regular urban transport passengers. Nonetheless, these entries, compared to informative publications, did not attain significant users' engagement.

The disproportionally low representation of publications, which included thanks, was associated with an absence of entries, which could be treated as a kind of an apology for the disruptions of the transport service. Entries that contained apologies appeared on the T-TTA occasionally. However, they were related to the specific users' questions, for instance, a moderator apologised for providing incomplete information: 'Hi, sorry we can't be more specific but I would strongly suggest you finish your journey by 18:00' (8.07.2015: www.twitter.com/TfLTravelAlerts/status/618787616633323520). This technique was applied only on the SNS. The publications and the statements given by the representatives of the organisation in the traditional media contained apologies addressed to the London residents.

In studied publications, except the entries mentioned above, the entries expressing highlighted bias and emotions were not found. In addition, the organisation did not comment on the attitude of the employees or the trade unions after the industrial action. During the London Underground strike, the TfL focused on providing information related to their then current situation and avoided opinions and comments about specific persons.

Modification of users' engagement model during the London Underground strike

Changes discussed above were accompanied by an increase in users' activity. Detailed analysis of the SNS users' commitment indicates changes in the strength and the type of they involvement in a crisis communication. The data will be presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Types of users' activity on TfL SNS channels on 6–12.07.2015 and 5–11.10.2015

date	F-TfL				T-TfL				T-TTA			
	like	share	com.	Σ	like	ret.	ment.	Σ	like	ret.	ment.	Σ
06.07	3779	1134	224	5137	296	186	669	1151	37	20	109	166
07. 07	733	172	95	1000	287	516	1169	1972	53	95	215	363
08. 07	641	212	166	1019	825	1328	2970	5123	270	720	830	1820
09. 07	1513	307	514	2334	386	595	3726	4707	97	165	368	630
10. 07	26	0	0	26	66	120	688	874	31	27	70	128
11. 07	136	3	11	150	26	80	454	560	22	10	32	64
12. 07	0	0	0	0	22	19	247	288	13	1	20	34
Σ 6–12.07	6828	1828	1010	9666	1908	2844	9923	14675	523	1038	1644	3205
Σ 5–11.10	8929	1638	403	10970	652	504	3796	4952	107	77	298	482

com.: comment, ret.: retweet, ment.: mention

Source: Based on one's own research results.

Aggregated data from Table 3 shows that the highest users' activity results were found on the Facebook page, in particular on 6.07.2015. It should be emphasised that posts published on that day contained requests for the supply of bottled water while travelling (6.07.2015:

www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/photos/a.231642850225865.59681.21203
8972186253/921665841223559), the coverage of the Chiswick Bridge opening anniversary
(6.07.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/photos/a.231642850225865.59681.212
038972186253/926926204030856) and the advice on how to use the payment system
(6.07.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/videos/913359178720892). Facebook
users showed the maximal involvement on the day when the organisation did not release
information on the industrial action. In contrast, a different situation took place on both
Twitter accounts, the T-TfL and T-TTA. All activity indicators suggest that Twitter users
were maximally engaged on the first day of the action. As shown in Table 2, the saturation
content associated with the London Underground strike was highest for the T-TfL and the
T-TTA (100% and 85.86% respectively). A direct correlation between users' and organisa-
tion's activities indicate that the readers were interested in information related to the Lon-
don Underground strike. Meanwhile, the general activity data proves that publications on
the industrial action did not positively influence the aggregated number of Facebook us-
ers' engagement.

However, significant changes were found in detailed data. An increased number (per-
centage wise) of comments and an increased percentage importance of commenting oc-
curred on the TfL Facebook page during the study period. According to the data presented
in Table 3, the percentage contribution of comment activities was, from 6 to 12 June: 4.36,
9.50, 16.29, 22.02, 0, 7.33, 0. The highest values of this parameter were observed during the
industrial action. Commenting on the Facebook page requires the largest users' effort, de-
spite the 'likes' activities. Therefore, it may be said that results of this part of the research
suggest that users were interested in active participating in the discussion as well as in giv-
ing the simplest acceptance signals of the TfL publication on Facebook.

There were two trends on the TfL Twitter accounts during the industrial action. The first
one: there was a rapid increase in mentions and sharing status updates. The second one
was an enormous predominance of the mentions and shares numbers versus 'likes' activi-
ties. The data provided in Table 3 clearly shows that mentioning and sharing took maxi-
mal value during the industrial action. Despite the control period, these activities on Twit-
ter were increasingly selected by users from 7 to 9 July 2015. In relation to these results, it is
possible to say, that publicity on London Underground strike correlated not only with the
total sum but also with the sum of the least frequent, in regular conditions, users' activities.

Conclusions

The research was designed to determine the effect of the crisis on communication conduct-
ed by the organisation in the SNS. Going back to the three research questions, posed at the
beginning of this study, it is now possible to state detailed answers.
RQ1: Is organisation *modus operandi* on SNS during the strike action different from activi-
ty in the normal period?

A dialogue is one of the main objectives of the public relations activities (Olędzki 2006: 22). In this area, the organisation's strategy of communication in the SNS was not changed; the moderator did not reply to users' questions on Facebook or the T-TfL, and specific issues were redirected to specialised Twitter accounts. A large number of answers to users' questions, both in the study and control period, give an indication that the T-TTA was continuously regarded as the main channel for conducting dialogue and real-time communication in the social media with London citizens.

However, the TfL verified some components of the communication strategy. The multimedia content was not published on Facebook. It was a significant decision due to the high popularity of entries that contained multimedia, including technically advanced videos. It is worth mentioning that the company chose a different communication tactic during the second London Underground strike in August 2015. At that time, it prepared a professional technique: high-quality multimedia content was published on the F-TfL Facebook page for example: entries containing images of TfL employees showing travellers' alternative ways of transport during the London Underground strike (6.08.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/photos/a.231642850225865.59681.212038972186253/943697609020382 and 6.08.2015: www.facebook.com/transportforlondon/photos/a.231642850225865.59681.212-038972186253/943745989015544).

RQ2: How was the subject of the industrial action in the London Underground presented on the TfL SNS channels?

A significant percentage of current, and useful-for-users, status updates and underrepresentation of the content appealing to emotions leads to the conclusion that the social media was mainly used for information purposes during the urban transport crisis. Moreover, findings on the informative function of the SNS are supported by the lack of bias and subjective statements on specific persons, namely representatives of the trade unions, on the TfL channels in social media. This finding is mainly related to Twitter where information is the primary function of communication for organisations (Lovejoy 2012: 342–343).

In the subject of the posts, functions of the particular channels were clearly defined. The promotional content was published throughout the Facebook page. Information on the major service disruptions, the involvement of the organisation in social activities, as well as improvements and investments in transport infrastructure were published on the T-TfL. The T-TTA account was intended to provide information on current incidents. Qualitative and quantitative results support the conclusion that transport agencies focused mainly on Twitter during unplanned service disruptions (Pender et al. 2014).

RQ3: Did publications related to the transport disruptions affect users' engagement model?

According to data obtained in this part of the research, consumers of transport services found TfL channels in social media a relevant source of information from the organisation during the crisis. Nevertheless, the progressive increase in all indicators of users' involvement shows that Twitter was considered as a channel providing more appropriate, accurate and current information for users of the urban transport in London during the study period in comparison to Facebook.

The aggregate figures show that the T-TfL attracted greater numbers of involved users than the T-TTA. However, the percentage difference between the increase of users' commitment on the T-TfL (196.35%, in comparison to the control period) and the T-TTA (564.94%, respectively) confirms that users found the second Twitter profile the most useful channel during the crisis. Other channels were complementary and completed the communication conducted on the T-TTA.

The importance of the activities requiring the superlative engagement of users – comments, mentions, and retweets (Boyd, Golder, Lotan 2010: 3) – during the industrial action increased in comparison to the control period. These results demonstrate that users adopted the SNS as a platform for dialogue and they wanted to participate in the communication process, not only as content consumers but also as a source of information.

Further research

Industrial actions in urban transport systems have a significant impact on the communication process in the SNS and practical functioning of the society. This study is limited to the case of Transport for London. It would be interesting to compare these results to experiences of more than one transport agency during the same crisis situations. Such an exploration might show principles of conducting a dialogue on the SNS during industrial actions and contribute to verification of *modus operandi* in the urban transport organisation in the social media.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

F-TfL   TfL official Facebook page (www.facebook.com/transportforlondon)
TfL   Transport for London
T-TfL   TfL official organisation Twitter account (www.twitter.com/tfl)
T-TTA   TfL Twitter channel @TlfTravelAlerts used for real-time communication
           (www.twitter.com/tlftravelalerts)

REFERENCES

Boyd D.m., Golder S., Lotan G., *Tweet, tweet, retweet: conversational aspects of retweeting on Twitter*, Conference paper, System Sciences (HICSS) 2010 43rd Hawaii International Conference on IEEE, p. 1–10. Doi: 10.1109/hicss.2010.412.

Boyd d.m., Ellison N.B., 2007, *Social network sites: definition, history, and scholarship*, 'Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication', 13 (1), p. 210–230. DOI:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x.

Bregman S., 2012, *Uses of social media in public transportation*, Washington. DOI:10.17226/14666.

Brooks-Pollock T., 2015, *Tube strike today shuts down every London Underground line for the first time in 13 years*. 'The Independent', 7.07.2015. (Retrieved from: www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/tube-strike-live-which-lines-will-be-affected-victoria-jubilee-district-circle-piccadilly-bakerloo-10371666.html, 7.07.2015).

Cottrill C., Yeboah G., Gault P., Nelson J.D., Anable J., Budd T., 2015, *Tweeting transport: examining the use of Twitter in transport events*. Conference paper, UTSG London, January 2015, p. 1–12. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.3095.2486.

Gal-Tzur A., Grant-Muller S.M., Kuflik T., Minkov E., Nocera S., Shoor I., 2014, *The potential of social media in delivering transport policy goals*. 'Transport Policy', 32 (2), p. 115–123. DOI:10.1016/j.tranpol.2014.01.007.

Irvine S., 2015, *Tube strike – Web and open data analytics*, TfL official weblog. (Retrieved from: blog.tfl.gov.uk/2015/08/10/tube-strike-web-and-open-data-analytics, 10.08.2015).

Kaczmarek-Śliwińska M., 2013, *Public relations w przestrzeni mediów społecznościowych. Działania organizacji i jej pracowników*, Koszalin.

Khang H., Ki E.J., Ye L., 2012, *Social media research in advertising, communication, marketing, and public relations, 1997–2010*. 'Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly', 89 (2), p. 279–298. DOI: 10.1177/1077699012439853.

Khomami N., Gani A., Tran M., Ratcliffe R., 2015, *Tube strike: commuters struggle in worst disruption for 13 years*. 'The Guardian', 9.07.2015. (Retrieved from: www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/jul/09/tube-strike-london-communters-chaos-rail-bus-trains, 9.07.2015).

Leetaru K., Wang S., Padmanabhan A., Shook E., 2013, *Mapping the global Twitter heartbeat: The geography of Twitter*. 'First Monday', 18 (5). DOI: 10.5210/fm.v18i5.4366

Lloyd K., 2015, *19 surprisingly good #tubestrike discounts*. 'Timeout London', 9.07.2015. (Retrieved from: www.timeout.com/london/blog/19-surprisingly-good-tubestrike-discounts, 9.07.2015).

Lovejoy K., Saxton G.D., 2012, *Information, community, and action: how nonprofit organizations use social media*, 'Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication', 17 (3), p. 337–353. DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01576.x.

Marwick A.E., boyd, 2010 d., *I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience*. 'New Media & Society', 13 (1), p. 114–133. DOI: 10.1177/1461444810365313.

Mulhern F., 2009, *Integrated marketing communications: from media channels to digital connectivity*. 'Journal of Marketing Communications', 15 (2–3), p. 85–101. DOI: 10.1080/13527260902757506.

O'Reilly T., 2005, *What is web 2.0. Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software*. O'Reilly Media official website, 30.09.2005. (Retrieved from: www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html, 29.10.2015).

Olędzki J., 2006, *Public relations w komunikacji społecznej*, in: J. Olędzki, D. Tworzydło (ed.), *Public relations. Znaczenie społeczne i kierunki rozwoju*, Warszawa, p. 17–48.

Pemberton B., 2015, *Don't let the Tube strike derail your mood… The London hotel deals that'll transform your evening from hellish to heavenly*, 'The Daily Mail', 8.07.2015. (Retrieved from: www.dailymail.co.uk/travel/travel_news/article-3153289/Don-t-let-Tube-strike-derail-mood-London-hotel-deals-ll-transform-evening-hellish-heavenly.html, 8.07.2015).

Pender B., Currie G., Delbosc A., Shiwakoti N., 2014, *International study of current and potential social media applications in unplanned passenger rail disruptions*, 'Transportation Research Record. Journal of the Transportation Research Board', 2419, p. 118–127. DOI: 10.3141/2419-12.

Pender B., Currie G., Delbosc A., Shiwakoti N., 2014, *Social media use during unplanned transit network disruptions: a review of literature*, 'Transport Reviews', 34 (4), p. 501–521. DOI: 10.1080/01441647.2014.915442.

TfL, 2015, *London Underground performance report. Period 4 2015/16. 28 June 2015 – 25 July 2015*. (Retrieved from: www.content.tfl.gov.uk/lu-performance-report-period-4-2015-16.pdf, 12.09.2015).

Topham G., 2015, *London commuters battle to get home as tube strike begins*, 'The Guardian', 8.08.2015. (Retrieved from: www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/jul/08/tube-strike-london-travel-mayhem-24-hours, 8.08.2015).

Vertesi J., 2008, *Mind the gap: the London underground map and users' representations of urban space*, 'Social Studies of Science', 38 (7), p. 7–33. DOI: 10.1177/0306312707084153

Wright D.K., Hinson M.D., 2014, *An updated examination of social and emerging media use in public relations practice: a longitudinal analysis between 2006 and 2014*, 'Public Relations Journal', 8 (2), p. 1–36.

KOMUNIKACJA TRANSPORT FOR LONDON PROWADZONA W MEDIACH SPOŁECZNOŚCIOWYCH PODCZAS AKCJI STRAJKOWEJ PRACOWNIKÓW METRA W LONDYNIE

Słowa kluczowe: media społecznościowe, serwisy społecznościowe, Facebook, Twitter, komunikacja kryzysowa, transport publiczny

STRESZCZENIE

W artykule przedstawiono badania na temat wpływu akcji strajkowej w londyńskim metrze w okresie 8–9 lipca 2015 r. na komunikację prowadzoną przez Transport for London (TfL) w serwisach społecznościowych. Postawiono trzy pytania badawcze. P1: Czy tryb postępowania organizacji zmienił się w okresie strajku? P2: W jaki sposób temat strajku w metrze w Londynie był prezentowany na oficjalnych profilach TfL? P3: Czy publikacje związane z sytuacją kryzysową wpłynęły na model zaangażowania odbiorców w serwisach społecznościowych? Wnioski z badań wskazują, że organizacja zasadniczo nie zmieniła

swojej strategii postępowania w mediach społecznościowych, administratorzy skupiali się na publikowaniu informacji, unikali osobistych i emocjonalnych publikacji oraz komentarzy na temat zachowania konkretnych osób lub grup. Stwierdzono jednak, że informacje związane z zakłóceniami w transporcie miały wpływ na zmianę zachowania użytkowników, w szczególności na dywersyfikację ich aktywności.