

2

Terminological Definitions

Abstract This chapter presents the theoretical underpinnings for the book. First, soft power is defined and related issues to soft power are discussed. Next, the chapter introduces the notion of nation branding as an important asset in responding to political challenges. Moreover, the chapter presents different theoretical underpinning and empirical findings related to nation branding. Finally, the chapter explains public diplomacy and its relationship with soft power and nation branding.

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

- Develop an understanding of soft power concept
- Learn about the aim of soft power
- Develop an understanding of nation branding concept
- Learn about public diplomacy and its similarities and differences with nation branding
- Identify nation brands from product brands
- Learn about the notion of public diplomacy and its interactions with nation branding

2.1 Soft Power

The notion of soft power was originally conceptualized in 1990 by Joseph Nye, the American university professor at Harvard University, in a book titled *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power, Soft Power*. The

introduction of this notion to the international relations literature created significant changes in the academic discourses about power. While Nye's book was originally written to address the role of the United States in the world and the forms of power it utilized in the past, the concept of soft power soon expanded to other countries and areas. Nye (1990, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c) introduced a new facet to the definition and understanding of power which is the fact that the sources of power have changed. Nye (1990) argues that since the world is characterized by exhibiting increasing interdependence, states have to adapt to the limitations of military power. As such, he believes that states should utilize all of the tools that are available to them to leverage their influence. Nye proposes that due to the changing world, factors such as geography and population are becoming less central; on the other hand, elements such as culture, institutions, technology, education, sports, and ideology play an important role in assessing the power of a state.

2.1.1 Nye's Conceptualization of Soft Power

Nye (1990) defined power as "ability to do things, control others to do what they would not necessarily do" (p. 154). While Nye (1990), akin to other theoreticians such as Cline, Knorr, and Morgenthau, considers power as "the possession of resources is more practical than in terms of the behavioral definition of power" (Nye, 1990, p. 26), he offers a new schema for sources of power that is more in accordance with the new developments in international relations and international environment. Nye sees powers as a continuum ranging from hard power to soft power. Hard power is viewed as "command power," whereas soft power is considered as "co-optive power." The former end of the continuum corresponds to the use of coercion, and the latter reflects the use of attraction.

Along the continuum, Nye considers other behaviors including inducement, agenda-setting, and attraction. Nye believed that a state might gain the outcomes it wants to see in the world because other states have agreed to the system that creates such outcomes. As such, it seems essential to structure the situations and plan the agenda so that the other countries change in particular situations and particular directions. Nye calls the aspect of power that leads to getting other want what you want co-optive power. This is in contrast to the active command behavior in which a state gets another state do what it wants. In other words, co-optive power is concerned with presenting one's ideas attractively and setting the agenda in world politics so that "shapes preferences that others express" (Nye, 1990, p. 32). Later, in 2004, Nye provided a better

distinction between hard power and soft power by including coercion and inducement on the hard power end of the continuum and considered that using tools such as military force and sanctions as execution of coercion. He also thought of bribes, aid, and payments as inducements. On the other hand, Nye put agenda setting and attraction under the soft power end of the continuum. To Nye, institution building was considered as an agenda setting strategy, and employing culture, values, and policies were among the resources for building attraction.

From 1990 to 2004, Nye's description of soft power changes slightly. In his book *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* published in 2004, Nye describes soft power as:

- The ability to shape the preferences of others
- Getting others to want the outcomes that you want
- The ability to attract (pp. 5–6)

Moreover, in his classification of different forms of power, Nye (2004a, 2004b, 2004c) identifies three types of power. The first one is military power that is characterized by behaviors such as coercion, deterrence, and protection. The primary currencies of military power are threats and force, and the government policies using military power might include war, coercive diplomacy, and alliance. The second type of power, according to Nye, is economic power which exhibits behaviors including inducement and coercion whose primary currencies are sanctions and payments. The government policies for economic power may consist of aid, bribes, and sanctions. Soft power, as the third type of power to Nye, is characterized by attraction and agenda setting. The main currencies for soft power are culture, values, policies, and institutions. The states who employ soft power employ public diplomacy and bilateral and multilateral diplomacy to pursue their goals.

As mentioned above, soft power uses different resources to create attraction. One of these resources is the values of a state. As Nye notes, the values that a state advocates can be indicated via official announcements and most importantly through the actions that the state does. Values can result in attractiveness only when the beliefs are expressed consistently, and the actions are taken to follow those values. Nye (2004a, 2004b, 2004c) believes that the degree to which a state adheres to its values can influence the credibility of that nation. To be more precise, high adherence to the values can corroborate the credibility of a nation, whereas low adherence can undermine the state's credibility. It is believed that states which support globally shared values such as peace and human rights would probably have higher levels of attractiveness

(Feizi, 2018). In contrast, egoistic, arrogant, and hypocritical policies are likely to weaken a state's soft power (Feizi, 2018; Nye, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c).

Culture is the second resource with which soft power creates attractiveness. Culture can consist of a wide range of attitudes, traditions, and ideas that typify a society. Culture can be attractive when people from other nations and contexts interact with the culture of the target country through business trade, tourism, international education, etc. It should of course be mentioned that Nye does not discuss qualities and characteristics that make a culture attractive. The next resource for soft power is policies. National and foreign policies are a tool for promoting attraction when they are in accord and consistent with the standards and norms of the international community. To Nye, foreign policy is particularly important because "both the most volatile and the most susceptible to government control" (Nye 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, p. 68). Finally, playing an important role in international institutions is the fourth resource for creating attraction. By having a strong role in international institutions, a country can influence the preferences of other countries and states. Moreover, positions in international institutions can create opportunities for agenda setting, which is another strategy employed by soft power.

2.1.2 Gaining Soft Power

While many nations might possess the resources needed for soft power, Nye asserts that having the resources is not enough and particular actions and behaviors need to be undertaken to translate the resources into soft power. In this regard, Nye outlines three focal criteria that increase a state's soft power (Feizi, 2018; Nye, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c). These three elements are:

1. Nations gain soft power when their culture closely fits dominant global norms (e.g., autonomy, pluralism).
2. Nations achieve soft power if they are seen credible because of their domestic performance and active role in the international arena.
3. States can obtain soft power provided that they have sufficient communication challenges to affect how issues are framed.

As mentioned earlier, one of the key strategies for gaining soft power is agenda setting. In this respect, Nye believes that effective use of institutions can significantly assist in setting the agenda they want. In other words, Nye considers a country's behavior as a major element in agenda setting. The second behavior associated with soft power is attraction. Nye believes issues such

as that daily communication, strategic communication, elaborating on the state's domestic and foreign policy decisions, and keeping relationships with others over time via training, scholarships, conferences, seminars, exchanges, and access to media can significantly affect attraction (Nye, 2004b).

Soft power is important for small states in that it can bring them advantages such as security, popularity, and global significance (Stokke, 2010, 2012). Past evidence indicates that several countries have obtained influence via the implementation and exercise of soft power. For example, the United Kingdom, even though it faced major issues such as Brexit, has used media and entertainment through cultural research and global engagement. Moreover, Japan has used its technological advancements to emphasize its cultural and industrial influences. Other studies such as the Netherlands and Sweden have gained soft power through their educational institutions and innovation and investment opportunities, respectively (Karki & Dhungana, 2020). Finally, some others believe that the liberal image of the United States has been one of its key tools for the exercise of soft power.

2.2 Nation Branding

Every nation or country has a compound of historical and contemporary associations that can be used to promote a nation's image in the world (Fan, 2006). The study of how different techniques can be used to develop a nation's image is studied under the notion of nation branding. During the past few decades, several scholars have tried to define nation branding. Table 2.1 presents some of the definitions presented for nation branding since 2000.

In one of these widely cited definitions, Fan (2006) defines nation branding as "applying branding and marketing communications techniques to promote a nation's image" (p. 6). Fan (2006) believes that nation branding can be interpreted in several ways. According to Fan (2006), nation branding, at the simplest level, is synonymous with product-country image in which the name of the country or its logo is used, either by companies or organizations, to highlight the country of origin. In this type of branding, the main objective is to utilize a nation's image to encourage sales or exports. A second type of nation branding is to the country or a city in the country as a tourism destination. This type of branding is called place branding and is considered an element of tourism marketing. The aim of place branding is not only to attract tourists and visitors but also to pave the way for foreign investment, settlement, and job creation (Fan, 2006). In politics, governments manipulate the country's image so as to cope with those of enemy countries.

Table 2.1 Common definitions for nation branding

Scholar	Definition
Kotler and Gertner (2002)	The sum of beliefs and impressions that people have of that place. The image represents a simplification of a large number of associations and pieces of information connected with a place. They are the product of mind trying to process and pick out essential information from huge amounts data of a place
Anholt (2005a, 2005b)	The nation brand is the sum of people’s perceptions of a country across the six areas of national competence: The cultural, political, commercial, and human assets, investment potential, and tourist appeal. The process of creating a certain “brand” for a particular country, formulating it in audio and visual messages and relationships, and transmitting them to the outside world through various means and channels of communication
Florek (2005)	The process of establishing positive association for the nation itself, its people, and its products
Fan (2006)	Nation branding concerns applying branding and marketing communications techniques to promote a nation’s image. Nation branding counts several sources as its “parents,” including country of origin, destination branding in tourism, as well as public diplomacy and national identity
Fetscherin (2010)	A country brand belongs to the public domain; it is complex and includes multiple levels, components, and disciplines. It entails the collective involvement of the many stakeholders it must appeal to. It concerns a country’s whole image, covering political, economic, social, environmental, historical, and cultural aspects

Source: Hao et al. (2019, p. 3) and Feizi (2018)

2.2.1 Nation Branding: The Origin and Developments over Time

Nation brand or branding was first conceptualized by Simon Anholt and Wally Olins in the 1990s. Anholt and Olins developed the notion of nation branding to interpret the practical application of building a unique mental image for a particular country and conveying this image to other countries and peoples of the world. They proposed that this application may employ the tools such as public diplomacy, trade, tourism, media, public relations, marketing, and humanitarian initiatives to make national identity tangible, powerful, and useful to others (via forming relationships based on interests) and to transmit this national identity through channels of communication (Anholt, 2007).

In its early stages, the cognitive theory of nation branding emerged from the literature and theories of marketing science and art, to encourage states and nations to deal with programs and plans of economic development from

a marketing perspective that involves competition. Nations have to improve the level and quality of economic development and convert themselves into marketing tools able to attract and maintain foreign investors, tourists, and outstanding human resources (brains). Thus, the process of nation branding is important to support sustainable national development and to enhance the competitiveness of the state both locally and internationally. In 2004, Nye suggested that this view has prompted many countries to develop a process of “nation branding,” as a tool of soft power, in the context of their political strategy. This was notable after the end of the Cold War, the dismantling of the bipolar system, and world politics’ attempt to replace the traditional struggle of balance of power with tools that are suitable for the concepts of the free world and open competitive markets.

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, the concept of “nation brand” has correlated with the concept of “globalization.” The process of nation branding turned into an important method or approach in formulating the values of national development, improving the quality of individuals’ lives, and improving the conditions of the state’s competitiveness in the global markets. In this regard, Szondi (2008) believed that nation brand has become a powerful and effective tool that enables the nation to invest its national resources in preserving its national values. Some even consider using soft power to build a nation as an essential component of the nation’s power in the global system. In fact, the end of the Cold War and the international community’s conversion into globalization has contributed to the evolution of the concept and applications of nation brand. On the one hand, the emerging states, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the disintegration of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, and the collapse of the socialist camp, tried to create new national brands that reflect and reinforce their independence so as to find a place in the international arena. On the other hand, the new international reality produced other forms of economic and non-economic differences between nations. Such differences have deepened in many cases, generating political, cultural, and social conflicts that threaten the independence and stability of many peoples and nations. Therefore, many countries realized the importance of national brand in protecting their identity and existence, while other nations found that a nation brand reinforces the elements of their soft power. Additionally, powerful countries found that the national brands assisted in enhancing their competitiveness and strengthening their political influence. On the other hand, some countries considered nation branding as a robust solution to bridge the gaps between peoples, to end conflicts, as well as to provide better economic opportunities and cultural climates for citizens and nations alike.

Of course, it should be mentioned that soft power should not be confused with other concepts such as national branding. One important point is that soft power includes issues such as nation branding and public diplomacy in itself. However, soft power is specified with unrestricted actors involved in itself. In fact, everything can be implemented via soft power “even the thing that in the first glance seems as not proper for a soft power but is included in the framework of soft power by the method used there” (Haxhimehmeti, 2015, p. 399).

Since 2005, Simon Anholt has devised an index to measure the brand of a nation through an annual mail survey, involving 10,000 participants from 20 countries around the world. The index includes a list of 50 countries and was developed by a partnership between Simon Anholt and GfK, the American market research organization. Since 2008, the index has become known as the Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index. The index includes among Middle Eastern countries Egypt, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. The Anholt-GfK Index measures five elements: exportability of the nation's products, governance, culture and people, tourism and immigration, and the size and attractiveness for foreign investment. The 2010 results of the index, for example, clearly showed that the following countries were in the top ten ranks: the United States, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Japan, Canada, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, and Sweden. Smart states, just like smart companies, aim to go beyond their acquired identity and their stereotyped mental image to create an exceptional and distinctive national brand that results from the interaction of all elements of the country's image in the minds of the international community. These elements include people, geography, culture, language, history, cuisine, fashion, figures, and famous brands.

Many Eastern European countries sought to create a national brand, particularly states that emerged as independent political entities after the collapse of the socialist system and the Soviet Union. These states include Poland, Latvia, Croatia, and Bulgaria. Other countries aimed to create the nation brands to enhance the morale of its citizens, strengthen their competitive position, and reinforce their presence on the international scene. South Korea, Britain, Ireland, Australia, Norway, and Finland are among such countries. However, one of the most pressing experiences in this regard belongs the post-apartheid South Africa, which has been engaged in the process of creating a national brand since the mid-1990s to achieve basic objectives including:

1. Ending the state of division that took root in society over the long decades of apartheid policies

2. Consolidation of social security and elimination of social ills that have penetrated the structure of society, such as organized crime, the spread of drugs, and the resulting serious social phenomena, like the spread of deadly diseases such as AIDS
3. Revitalizing the national economy and the rehabilitation of infrastructure and the associated opportunities to provide more jobs and reduce unemployment
4. Restoring the confidence of the international community and restoring its place on the world map as an emerging state that is capable of playing a global role, particularly with respect to conflict resolution and ending civil or intra-continental war in the black continent
5. Encouraging and attracting foreign investment by creating a safe and attractive environment for investment (source: www.gcis.gov.za)

In order to achieve the above objectives, special committees were formed and dozens of public meetings were held involving components of the state and society, such as departments of public and private institutions, civil society organizations, and citizens. The task of the committees in charge was divided into two categories: first, to develop a national communication strategy to regulate the mechanism and channels of communication between the state and its citizens. The second category was to create a national brand that introduces the new South Africa to the outside world. The most prominent event in the context of building the national brand was hosting the football World Cup in 2010. It was an event and occasion to show the achievements of South Africa in building a modern state to the world, introduce it as a country safe for and ready to attract investment capitals, and identify it as a country capable of playing an active role in the international arena.

Recently, the field has witnessed a decline in the evolution of the concept of nation branding. The most concerning fact for researchers and practitioners in the field is that some of the nation brand theorists, Simon Anholt at the top of them, have recently criticized the very concept of nation brand. In his writings and seminars, Anholt has repeated that nation branding does not exist and that what is commonly mentioned about nation branding is nothing but pure illusion. He claimed that “To brand a country is vain, naïve, and foolish.” Instead, in his writings, Anholt promoted another concept, “competitive identity,” which he described as the new concept of improving the competitiveness of a nation through the employment of public diplomacy and brand management. Nevertheless, Anholt still uses the concepts of brand and nation brand on his website to distinguish between these and other concepts such as advertising, marketing, public relations, and public diplomacy.

Whatever terminology used, the idea of nation branding seems to remain as an important aspect of executing soft power as well as an essential tool for success in global markets.

2.2.2 Differences Between Nation Brand and Product Brand

Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines brand as “a class of goods identified by name as the product of a single firm or manufacture” and as “a public image, reputation, or identity conceived of as something to be marketed or promoted.” Moreover, brand, according to the definition by the American Marketing Association (AMA), refers to “name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competition.” Nonetheless, a nation brand is different from a product or service in that it symbolizes a wide range of concepts and factors including but not limited to individuals (ethnicity, race), celebrities and famous persons (footballers, actresses, poets), places (tourism attractions), natural resources, language, culture, history, handicrafts, and political systems.

Nation brand is different from a product brand in several ways. First, a nation brand does not offer anything in particular, whereas a product brand always offers a specific product or service. Second, it is difficult to define the attributes of a nation brand; on the other hand, the attributes and characteristics of a product brand can be defined clearly. Third, a nation brand can only create emotional benefits for its audience, while a product brand has both emotional and functional advantages. Fourth, a nation brand is different from a product brand in terms of its ownership. A product brand's owner is legally identified by law. However, in nation branding, the nation does not own the nation brand. In fact, a nation brand is owned by any organization that produces a nation brand for commercial uses and exploits the country's image. Because a nation's brand is in the public domain and the nation cannot control their image, it can be manipulated by various third parties who wish to achieve different goals and ends. Fifth, it is really difficult to describe the audience for a nation brand because the audience for a nation brand are really diverse; on the other hand, the audience for a product brand are a targeted segment.

2.2.3 Parties Involved in Nation Branding

Gudjonsson (2005) proposes a “Nation Brand Influential Map” model to explain a nation’s dynamic and tools used to produce a successful and effective strategy to support its brands. These factors include people, economy, geography, and politics. Gudjonsson considers people as the most significant tool or nation branding. He argues that different facets of people’s lives including culture, costumes, and etiquette should be investigated and understood so as to promote and support a nation’s brand. Economy, including micro- and macroeconomics, is an important communication channel that can affect national competitive advantage. As such, it is essential to examine the context, resources, policies, and labor to understand how economics can influence nation branding. The next influential factor is politics, which is intertwined with a nation’s economics and culture. Finally, Gudjonsson identifies geography as an influential factor. He believes that a nation’s emotional attractions are mainly related to its geography. Cities, weather, climate, and nature are some attributes that are involved in how a nation is understood.

2.3 Public Diplomacy

Public diplomacy is one of the concepts that is closely connected to nation brand and nation branding. Since there is much overlap between the two concepts in theory and practice, in this subsection, we briefly review the key tenets of public diplomacy and its connections with nation branding. Public diplomacy is different from traditional diplomacy. Traditional diplomacy is defined as the practical application of foreign policy through political communication among the governments of different countries, while public diplomacy is practiced widely by informal bodies and formations. Moreover, traditional diplomacy was practiced by officials behind closed doors. Royce Ammon refers to traditional diplomacy as “old diplomacy” and argues that this form of diplomacy was practiced only until World War I. On the other hand, the practice of public diplomacy could be traced back to the 1950s (Szondi, 2008). In the 1960s, the concept acquired a new meaning, when Edmund Gullion used the concept of public diplomacy to describe the impact of the public on the attitudes and performance of foreign policy. In 1965, Gullion described public diplomacy as the role of the press and other media in international affairs, cultivation by governments of public opinion, the non-government interaction of private groups and interests in one country

with those of another, and the impact of these transnational processes on the formulation of policy and the conduct of foreign affairs (Szondi, 2008). According to Gullion, “public diplomacy encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication like diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the process of intercultural communications.”

Over the past few decades, the concept of public diplomacy has been a favorite concept in the context of international relations. It was used to explain the methods and tools used by states and international organizations to communicate with other (foreign) peoples and societies. Consequently, the practice of public diplomacy is associated with tools and means to influence public attitudes and their role in the orientations of foreign policy.

Nevertheless, the emergence and establishment of the term dates back to the height of the Cold War, which significantly influenced and shaped public diplomacy’s evolution and practice and tested its results. Historically, American public diplomacy can be divided into three different stages that are linked to changes in the international political climate and marked by the collapse of symbolical landmarks. The first period stretches over four decades wherein the efforts were dedicated intensively to spreading American and Western values and norms throughout Eastern Europe to persuade peoples living behind the Iron Curtain. The second period marked the collapse of the Berlin Wall. In this period, less efforts and resources were devoted to US public diplomacy which resulted in the decline of its role and influence worldwide. The third stage commenced with the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the collapse of the Twin Towers at the World Trade Center in New York. This time, the US public diplomacy was oriented toward the Arab and Muslim worlds and was marked by decline to some extent in favor of hard power. As it can be seen, public diplomacy acquired new meanings, and interpretations at each stage made it necessary to re-define and reinvigorate the concept. In 1990, Hans Tuch asserted that public diplomacy could not be an effective tool unless there was general agreement on its meaning. While public diplomacy still lacks a universally accepted definition, the meaning and content of the concept have become understood to a large extent in academic and professional circles.

Traditionally, public diplomacy is defined as “government communication efforts to influence foreign audiences in order to change their convictions or feelings.” Hans Tuch, a former US public affairs officer, also defines public diplomacy as “a government’s process of communicating with foreign publics

in an attempt to bring about an understanding of its nation's ideas and ideals, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and current policies" (Tuch, 1990). According to the US Department of State "public diplomacy seeks to promote the national interest of the United States through understanding, informing, and influencing foreign audiences" (www.publicdiplomacy.org). Tuch (1990) elaborates that public diplomacy encompasses the "official government efforts to shape the communications environment overseas in which American foreign policy is played out, in order to reduce the degree to which misperceptions and misunderstandings complicate relations between the U.S. and other nations." Public diplomacy is often associated with a country's endeavor to improve its image as a way to maximize its influence within the global community (Peterson, 2006).

It is noted that these definitions are limited to the stated goal of public diplomacy which is to influence the audience of the target country by changing beliefs and feelings, without mentioning the ultimate goal of public diplomacy. Put it another way, it aims to affect public opinion in the target country to put pressure on their government to change its foreign or domestic policy. Given the fact that public diplomacy often obscures this goal, this could be understood as masking it with other stated goals such as creating an open environment or promoting national interests.

In recent years, the concept of public diplomacy was redefined. In this context, Leonard (2002) stressed that public diplomacy is more concerned with building relationships than with policy guidance. According to Joseph S. Nye, former Assistant Secretary of Defense, professor at Harvard University, and author of *The Powers to Lead*:

Public diplomacy is an important tool in the arsenal of smart power, but smart public diplomacy requires an understanding of the roles of credibility, self-criticism, and civil society in generating soft power. If it degenerates into propaganda, public diplomacy not only fails to convince, but can undercut soft power. Instead, it must remain a two-way process, because soft power depends, first and foremost, upon understanding the minds of others. (Szondi, 2008)

Van Ham (2003) writes that, "A key element of public diplomacy is the building of personal and institutional relationships and dialogue with foreign audiences by focusing on values, which sets the activity apart from classical diplomacy, which primarily deals with issues" (p. 429). Public diplomacy activities include many daily activities (films, plays, seminars) and special programs (exchange of scholarships, economic forums, conferences, meetings, and academics). According to Wolf and Rosen (2004), the practice of public

diplomacy activities should not be limited to government departments or agencies. But it must be shared by all parties able to communicate and influence foreign audiences' attitudes. Public diplomacy may be linked with the national public in one of two approaches: whether through engaging citizens in the efforts of foreign policy or through explaining and clarifying the objectives of foreign policy to the national audience.

Often, the state's effort through community councils, non-governmental bodies, or political parties is more effective and efficient. Non-governmental bodies have a degree of credibility and reputation of being independent in a way that governments cannot be. Likewise, these bodies comprise of many professionals, foreign politicians, and activists. No governmental body or diplomatic mission can conduct pressure campaigns as non-governmental bodies can. Meanwhile, the relationship with expatriate citizens (national communities abroad) provides the state with countless capabilities in the areas of local language and knowledge of local culture as well as knowledge of political affairs and conditions of society. Furthermore, the establishment of relations and building bridges with political parties in various countries facilitates the mission of traditional diplomacy and provides a picture and information about the opposition parties and the possibilities of each party. It also provides channels for sharing policies. Moreover, the companies and their products and services are important tools in the creation of a nation brand, as successful and powerful brands contribute to changing the negative stereotypes and help to improve the national reputation.

Focusing on public diplomacy allows the small- and medium-sized countries with limited hard or soft power to play a greater role in the diplomatic arena through involvement in programs related to international civil society. Howard Cincotta said that "the world of communications, information revolution, and globalization will make future diplomacy depend more on the networks of relationships between individuals and technology." Talking about the key roles of public diplomacy, Pamela Smith (as cited in Kurbalija, 1998) mentioned that "the growth of communications technology has allowed more public awareness and involvement in foreign policy making." However, she does not feel that technological developments will ever eliminate the need for face-to-face diplomacy, as personal contact seems to be necessary to build trust and mutual respect between nations and states. In this context, Paul Sharp (2001, p. 343) expects that two new trends of public diplomacy will further develop:

1. The citizen diplomat as lobbyist or advocate of a particular international cause (e.g., human rights issues or issues related to the environment).

2. The star citizen diplomat as an autonomous agent in international relations, for example, world-renowned figures who act in a private capacity representing their own economic or political interests—celebrity diplomacy (such as Bill Gates, Ted Turner, and the Baptist minister Jesse Jackson). Such celebrities endeavor to contribute to solving some international issues or to support some humanitarian issues. On the global level, the star citizen diplomat is most notable among movie stars or athletes who are designated by international organizations as ambassadors of goodwill. They perform certain diplomatic humanitarian tasks. This form of citizen diplomat is turning into a common practice by states and local regional organizations and even by trade unions and civil society organizations.

2.3.1 The British Model of Public Diplomacy

In the 1990s, British public diplomacy underwent a comprehensive review. The transformations of Britain's public diplomacy today are only the output of the assessment of research undertaken in that period of time, which concluded that the outside world saw Britain as an outdated or expired country, heading down the slope, archaic, old, white, racist, and imperialist. Therefore, various public and private initiatives focused on changing this mental image and building a national image highlighting Britain as a modern, creative, and multicultural country. This process of change required a lot of planning and mobilization of public diplomacy and public relations efforts to identify the positive aspects that should be highlighted and promoted to introduce an "attractive" Britain to the outside world. Thus, British public diplomacy had to confront complex challenges. However, in this period it aimed to achieve two broad goals. The first goal was to defend the reputation of Britain in a way that introduces Britain and its policies to global audiences in an attractive and convincing way, while the second goal was to build trust with the audience by creating mutual respect and understanding that allows for differences.

Since 1997, British governments have worked to create this new climate of trust with its European partners and the rest of the world. Tony Blair, the British Prime Minister at that time, promised to turn Britain into a "young country." He also confirmed his intention to renew the British national identity and to create a national sense that reflects the reality of Britain at the end of the twentieth century. In 2002, the British government announced the establishment of a council to coordinate the efforts of public diplomacy strategy by promoting government initiatives to build relationships with nations

around the world. This council was able to channel the efforts of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the British Council, the British Tourist Authority, and UK Trade and Investment into a unified strategy for public diplomacy centered on two issues: dynamic tradition and principle and professionalism. Intensive efforts were made to build a new image of Britain. The new Britain is a creative and innovative country that has trained an active multicultural workforce. The marketing team worked hard to present Britain as an import and export center for ideas, goods, services, human resources, and cultures. During the years 2004 and 2005, British diplomacy efforts focused on introducing Britain as a country advanced in science and technology and a center of fashion, business, and design. In 2006, Britain reformulated its concept of public diplomacy, aiming at changing behavior, not concepts. Based on Bound et al. (2007), Britain outlined four purposes for public diplomacy in the twenty-first century, encouraging stakeholders to work in order to achieve the following:

1. *Increasing familiarity*: making people think about your country and updating their image of it.
2. *Increasing appreciation*: creating positive perceptions of your country and getting others to see issues from your perspective.
3. *Engaging people*: encouraging people to see your country as an attractive destination for tourism and study and encouraging them to buy its products and subscribe to its values.
4. *Influencing people's behavior*: getting companies to invest, encouraging public support for your country's positions, and convincing politicians to turn to it as an ally.

The British Foreign Office website reflects this concept by emphasizing that public diplomacy is what they used to achieve their strategic international priorities (SPs) through work with the public overseas. To achieve these goals, British public diplomacy depends on three main tools:

1. British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) World Service: plays a vital role in broadcasting news and information around the world. It is funded mainly by the Ministry of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs. Though primarily and historically a radio broadcaster, the BBC World Service has a strong online penetration, both through its websites and mobile services. On radio it operates, depending on the geography, on short wave, on medium wave, and, increasingly to serve the urban audience, on FM. The BBC World Service has now moved into the television

market with Arabic TV, launched in March 2008, and Persian TV, launched in January 2009.

2. The British Council: the United Kingdom's main vehicle for cultural relations with other countries. It works to strengthen the United Kingdom's reputation overseas through programs in education, the English language, the arts, science, information provision, governance, and human rights. It has offices in 110 countries and territories and around the United Kingdom. Here are some examples of the types of activities carried out by the British Council:
 - Organizing courses for leadership skills for youth. According to the British Foreign Office website, 40,000 young people in 20 countries have learned new leadership and teambuilding skills.
 - On air in 18 countries every week, 5 million people tune in to the British Council's Selector compilations of British music on their local radio stations.
 - The British Council administers English examination centers around the world and 1.2 million examinations each year in the United Kingdom.
3. Wilton Park: an executive agency under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth that holds conferences covering the fundamental challenges in international politics at its headquarters near the city of Brighton on the south coast of England. The conferences address a wide range of international issues and infrastructure and attract high-level participation from all over the world.

In addition to the efforts of these institutions and agencies, the Foreign Office publishes a wide range of printed flyers and billboards to use abroad. The Ministry also funds and produces television documentary materials for broadcast in more than 120 countries. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth cooperates with other partners from all sectors of the British government to promote programs in major global events, such as the Summer Olympic Games to be held in London in 2012.

2.3.2 Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding

The distinction between the concepts of public diplomacy and nation branding is still in the process of discussion and debate among academics, professionals, and practitioners. Some of them consider public diplomacy and

nation branding as two different concepts that do not share any common ground. Some others argue that both concepts share some points and are different in others. A third opinion is that the two concepts are synonymous and do not differ in their content, however different in form or definition. Finally, some try to distinguish between the two concepts on the basis of professionalism and its elements: “knowledge references’ availability, programs for training and education, professional organizations, and finally, professional rules and code of ethics” (Szondi, 2008).

The first opinion is based on the idea that both public diplomacy and nation branding are different in terms of strategies, objectives, tools, and actors. The second opinion argues that the relationship between the two concepts is complementary, and therefore, there is an overlap of strategies, objectives, and tools as the state, the public sector, and civil society share their roles. This integration or overlapping improves the performance of public diplomacy, increasing its effectiveness by reaching a wider audience through non-traditional or informal ways, with the possibility of applying tools, techniques, and methods of marketing communications (Szondi, 2008). Some advocates of nation branding theory go even further and consider public diplomacy a part of nation branding, especially with the fact that the latter offers general strategies to achieve broad objectives, while public diplomacy is related to foreign policies and its specific objectives. The third opinion argues that the two concepts are two sides of one coin and are based on a common ground to achieve common objectives, mainly promoting the state and improving its image and reputation. In this context, de Vicente (2004) viewed public diplomacy as a key dimension of nation branding and a multilateral initiative involving NGOs, the private sector, as well as individuals. In order to be effective, a strategy must be able to leverage public diplomatic efforts, such as a network of cultural or language institutes, the giving of developmental aid or participation in peacekeeping operations worldwide. In this sense, the process of nation branding is consistent with the core values and ideas of the country and is capable of representing the nation. Therefore, the process of nation branding must be at the core of the state’s strategies and directions. It should even guide the strategic options for decision-makers.

This theory concludes that states usually adopt any of the two concepts, depending on their goals and possibilities. Some states use the tools, methods, and techniques of public diplomacy, rather than being engaged in the process of branding. In contrast, there are countries that prefer to adopt methods and techniques of branding rather than public diplomacy. In most cases, the features of the two concepts are being integrated in a process that is based on the exchange of roles. On the other hand, there are those who believe that nation

branding and public diplomacy differ in goals, strategic tools, and actors. They identify the different elements as follows:

1. While the branding process is centered on creating a positive image of the country and relies on one-way communication in which the sender controls the content of the messages that is created to be simple and concise, leaving limited space for dialogue and interaction; public diplomacy is based on two-way communication, which depends on the exchange of dialogue in order to establish understanding and cooperation instead of competition.
2. If the main concept or key purpose of nation branding is to highlight the elements of the “excellence” or “uniqueness” of the state, its people or culture, as well as its geographical, natural, and climatic advantages, public diplomacy often focuses on the common elements that unite rather than divide people. This can be seen in the case of Eastern European countries that have sought to join Western Europe and the European Union after the collapse of the Eastern bloc and the Soviet Union. The public diplomacy strategy of these countries has focused on highlighting common elements between them and the countries of the European Union.
3. While the ultimate goal of the process of nation branding is to raise the level of awareness and knowledge of the country, the ultimate goal of public diplomacy is the establishment of mutual understanding that leads to close cooperation.
4. Another distinguishing difference between public diplomacy and nation branding is the approach. It is easy to identify the tools of branding which are often visible and concrete, while the tools of diplomacy are more precise and adopt symbolic methods. Branding is characterized by greater transparency and is more likely to apply accountability more than public diplomacy.
5. Branding often targets the nation’s broad masses, which are often described as passive or silent, while public diplomacy targets active and influential segments of the public, such as cultural or political elites, as well as public opinion leaders and those interested in foreign affairs and world events. Thus, the process of communication in nation branding is easier than in public diplomacy, which should, in many cases, communicate with groups opposed to government policies or individuals who have rigid views and opinions.

Szondi (2008) identifies the following differences between nation branding and public diplomacy. Table 2.2 presents these differences.

Table 2.2 The differences between nation branding and public diplomacy

	Public diplomacy	Nation branding
Objectives	Encouraging political goals and interest	Encouraging economic goals and interests
Setting	Politicized; focuses on and priorities can alter by change in the government	De-politicized; there is some agreement between actors and political parties
	Identity-based	Image-based
	International relations and culture drive it	Marketing and consumerism drive it
Target	Stakeholders and publics that are active	Consumers and masses that are passive
	Citizens	Consumers
	Geopolitical nations/countries	More universal and applicable to all countries
Direction	For foreign publics	For domestic and foreign audiences
Governments' role	Both initiator and sender of messages, controlled messages	Can be initiator but not sender
Actor	Different bodies including diasporas, cultural institutions, governmental organizations, embassies, NGOs, Ministry of Culture or Foreign Affairs	Travel agencies, export councils, National Commission for Tourism
Strategies	Building relationship and maintenance	Image management
	Building trust	
	Highlighting substance and content	Highlighting symbolic and visual elements
	Decentralized approach	Centralized approach
	Emphasizes both negative and positive elements	Emphasizes positive elements exclusively
Tactics	Film festivals, educational institutions, exhibitions, networking, relation building. Exchange programs, language learning	Electronic marketing, logos and slogans, Internet, advertising in the media, newspapers
Social or mass media role	Mass media: less significant	Mass media: passive
	Social media: more significant	
Budget/sponsor	Government	Public and private partners
Time	Continuous and ongoing	Strategic
Evaluation	Short-term, middle-term, and long-term	Long term

Despite all these differences, there are some attempts, though some immature or incomplete, to integrate nation branding and public diplomacy so as to benefit from the advantages of both of them and to increase their efficiency and effectiveness. According to this approach, as De Vincent (2004) suggests

that integrating nation branding and public diplomacy would lead to some positive results such as:

1. Making public diplomacy more strategic.
2. Facilitating strategic planning and coordination.
3. Integrating communication with foreign audiences.
4. Improving diplomats' communication skills, which are often poor.
5. Increasing the competitiveness of the nation at the global level.
6. Generating additional domestic as well as international media coverage for the country as the branding activities and campaign can receive media attention.
7. Revitalizing public diplomacy and making it tangible.
8. Putting a new spirit in the means and methods of accessing foreign audiences. Nation branding achieves access to the public base wider than that that can be accessed through public diplomacy.
9. Providing knowledge of reactions to public diplomacy efforts through measurement tools used in marketing research, as branding practitioners are more results-oriented and tend to deal quickly and efficiently with the output for the purpose of development or review.

On the other hand, integrating nation branding and public diplomacy might have drawbacks such as:

1. Some governmental personnel, particularly diplomats, might misunderstand nation branding and view it as advertising or propaganda.
2. The nation branding process may be negatively affected by bureaucracy, formal regulations, and the complexities of decision-making mechanisms in governmental circles.
3. The nation branding process may be weakened or disturbed by political disputes between the players, whether government bodies or political parties, in the political arena. This interrupts the process of nation branding, especially in the case of changing governments, particularly if the new government abolished the initiatives of the previous one.
4. Audiences may view nation branding as political promotion or official propaganda, and, therefore, this approach's output may backfire.

2.4 Objectives and Reasons for Nation Branding

Scholars believe that nation branding is performed to pursue different goals such as promoting a positive image of the country, establishing an identity for a nation, enhancing exports, attracting tourists, and motivating foreign investment (Anholt, 2003; Dinnie, 2008; Dzenovska, 2005; Florek & Conejo 2007). Moreover, Gudjonsson (2005) believes that nation branding can be used to create positive environment for nation's brands and products to compete in global markets. In addition, he believed that nation branding is done to enforce political and diplomatic purposes. In addition, Gudjonsson (2005) presents three main reasons for nation branding. The first reason is to guard brands against negative and unfavorable effects politics, governments, or international actions. The second one is to support and protect brands and businesses. Finally, the third purpose of nation branding is to escalate living standards within the country and build prosperity.

Furthermore, based on Szondi (2008), countries tend to create national brands due to some factors and circumstances, including:

1. Democratization, individuals' deepened knowledge and awareness of the terms of democratic governance, and the increasing need for transparency and openness between the key players in the state, which leads to the individual's increasing awareness and knowledge of international affairs and issues.
2. The growing influence and impact of global media.
3. Lower costs of travel and mobility of people and their increased ability to search for attractive touristic and investment destinations, however far away.
4. Globalization of the economic system and the increased number of cross-border international companies seeking investment in various parts of the world.
5. Increased products and services exported from a large number of world countries competing in international markets and the need of such goods, products, and services to enhance their position and the position of their country where they are produced.
6. Increasing competition between poor and developing countries to obtain funding and foreign aid, whether financial or technical. There is also the need of these countries to share their skills and expertise, attract investments, and open new markets for export.
7. Increased competition to attract talents and minds to immigrate.
8. Increased consumer demand and market expansion.

After knowing about the objectives of nation branding, it might be helpful to have a look at different parties that are involved in the process of creating a nation brand. This is described in detail in the next section.

2.5 Stages of Building a National Brand

Unlike public diplomacy efforts, which may be sporadic, spaced, or incoherent, and unlike the mental image, which is formed by impressions, exaggeration, and inconsistent subjective and objective factors, the nation brand is built through a branding process that passes through successive and cumulative phases that do not allow overtaking, jumping over, or confusion. Besides, the fact that these phases are integrated and compatible does not allow contradiction or discord. A nation brand is established through the following phases.

Phase 1: Higher Political Will

Studies show that the primary responsibility in the process of nation branding rests on the top of the state's administrative hierarchy. The first decision-maker in the state must be the initiator of adopting the branding strategy. Unless there is a higher political will, the process of branding will be vulnerable to complacency and lack of seriousness. Thus, it would collapse in the early stages. In contrast, the higher political will is urgently needed in the first stage and the rest of the stages for the following reasons:

- Highlighting the seriousness of adopting the new strategy and consequent commitment of all parties involved toward the requirements of the strategy's execution and the commitment to its outputs.
- Adding a moral and ethical dimension to the strategy by adopting it from the part of the first decision-maker.
- Enhancing the credibility and goals of the strategy.
- Providing (sustainability) to the process of the strategy.
- Providing administrative, structural, and financial support for the implementation of the strategy (such as the creation of administrative structures—functions and others), etc. This requires setting budgets.

Phase 2: Response and Commitment of Executive and Legislative Authorities

In this context, the government must ensure three key points:

- All governmental institutions and bodies behave harmoniously, compatibly, and logically.
- The process of nation branding will influence investors, tourists, and consumers, encouraging them to buy and spend money.
- The process of nation branding will influence the nation's citizens and their behavior.

For its part, the legislative authority is working to create a legal and appropriate environment and enact laws, rules, and regulations that facilitate the process of building a (nation) brand, such as the enactment of laws to encourage investment and public freedoms and others in various fields.

Phase 3: Developing a Long-Term Vision

In the process of developing a comprehensive long-term, strategic, and sustainable vision, those who are responsible should:

- Present the desired future for (next) generations.
- Be creative beyond the scope and standards of the current competitiveness.
- Match the collective vision of community members.

Phase 4: Collective Participation of All Segments of the Nation

The government must not be the only one making efforts for nation branding. The process of nation branding cannot succeed without concerted efforts from all individuals and parties of the nation, including official, unofficial, and social players. This may include professional groups, civic activists, civil society or non-governmental organizations, politicians, political parties, journalists, media institutions, businesspeople, stakeholders, corporations, academics, universities, and religious leaders.

Phase 5: Providing the Resources and Infrastructure

The net stage in developing a nation brand is to provide the resources and infrastructure required for the interacting elements in the process of creating the nation brand. This includes the establishment of the required government departments and agencies, human resources development and training, as well as helping the private sector and civil society to launch appropriate initiatives and developing specific mechanisms of action.

Phase 6: National Awareness Campaigns

Launching national awareness campaigns is a necessary requisite to promote the nation brand. Such campaigns include the following:

- Explaining the process of (nation) branding with its dimensions and components, etc.; emphasizing the national responsibility of each institution and individual; highlighting interests and benefits achieved for the nation's institutions and individuals.
- Distribution of roles, tasks, and messages for each sector: for example, intensifying the participation of institutions in exhibitions and international events, increasing the presence and activity of civil society institutions in the event of humanitarian disasters, and the national army's participation in the peacekeeping forces in conflict zones. Therefore, every institution acts as if it is an embassy and every citizen will act as he/she is an ambassador at large.

Phase 7: Reformulating Messages

The next phase in developing a nation brand is to reformulate messages including "the key messages" and "sector messages" while maintaining open channels of interaction, through national awareness campaigns to explain the dimensions of nation branding.

Phase 8: Communicating the Brand

The last step in establishing a nation brand is the activation and employment of all communication channels and tools: including public diplomacy, public relations, media and marketing, passing the key and sector messages to citizens and foreign public opinion.

References

- Anholt, S. (2003). *Brand new justice: The upside of global branding*. Oxford University Press.
- Anholt, S. (2005a). Anholt nation brands index: How does the world see America? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 45, 296–304.
- Anholt, S. (2005b). *Brand new justice: How branding places and products can help the developing world*. Elsevier.
- Anholt, S. (2007). *Competitive identity: The new brand management for nations, cities, and regions*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bound, K., Briggs, R., Holden, J., & Jones, S. (2007). *Cultural diplomacy*. <http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Cultural%20diplomacy%20-%20web.pdf>

- De Vicente, J. (2004). *State branding in the 21st century, master of arts in law and diplomacy thesis*. Fletcher International School, Tufts University.
- Dinnie, K. (2008). Japan's nation branding: Recent evolution and potential future paths. *Journal of Current Japanese Affairs*, 16(3), 52–65.
- Dzenovska, D. (2005). Remaking the nation of Latvia: Anthropological perspectives on nation branding. *Place Branding*, 1(2), 173–186.
- Fan, Y. (2006). Branding the nation: What is being branded? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(1), 5–14.
- Feizi, H. (2018). *Discourse, Affinity and Attraction: A Case Study of Iran's Soft Power Strategy in Afghanistan*. University of South Florida. USA.
- Fetscherin, M. (2010). The determinants and measurement of a country brand: The country brand strength index. *International Marketing Review*, 27, 466–479.
- Florek, M. (2005). The country brand as a new challenge for Poland. *Place Branding*, 1(2), 205–214.
- Florek, M., & Conejo, F. (2007). Export flagships in branding small developing countries: The cases of Costa Rica and Moldova. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 3(1), 53–72.
- Gudjonsson, H. (2005). Nation branding. *Place Branding*, 1(3), 283–298.
- Hao, A. W., Paul, J., Trott, S., Guo, C., & Wu, H. H. (2019). Two decades of research on nation branding: A review and future research agenda. *International Marketing Review*, 38, 46–69.
- Haxhimehmeti, G. (2015). The soft power of small countries: Kosovo challenges and potentials based on the experience of Switzerland and Slovenia. *ILIRIA International Review*, 5(1), 337–350.
- Karki, S., & Dhungana, S. (2020). Soft power in international relations: Opportunities for small states like Nepal. *Journal of International Affairs*, 3(1), 162–179.
- Kotler, P., & Gertner, D. (2002). Country as brand, product, and beyond: A place marketing and brand management perspective. *Journal of Brand Management*, 9, 249–261.
- Kurbalija, J. (1998). *Modern diplomacy*. Academic Training Institute. http://www.ati.usacademy.info/Books/Modern_Diplomacy.pdf
- Leonard, M. (2002). *Public diplomacy*. Foreign Policy Centre.
- Nye, J. S. (1990). *Bound to lead: The changing nature of American power*. Basic Books.
- Nye, J. S. (2004a). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics* (pp. 7–8). Public Affairs.
- Nye, J. S. (2004b). *The benefit of soft power*. HBS working knowledge.
- Nye, J. S. (2004c). *The decline of America's soft power*. Foreign Affairs.
- Peterson, J. E. (2006). Qatar and the world: Branding for a micro-state. *The Middle East Journal*, 60, 732–748.
- Sharp, P. (2001). *Making sense of citizen diplomats*. University of Leicester.
- Stokke, K. (2010). The soft power of a small state: Discursive constructions and institutional practices of Norway's peace engagement. *PCD Journal*, 2(1), 137–173.

- Stokke, K. (2012). Peace-building as small state foreign policy: Norway's peace engagement in a changing international context. *International Studies*, 49(3–4), 207–231.
- Szondi, G. (2008). *Public diplomacy and nation branding: Conceptual similarities and differences*. http://www.nbiz.nl/publications/2008/20081022_pap_in_dip_nation_branding.pdf
- Tuch, H. N. (1990). *Communicating with the world*. St. Martin's Press.
- Van Ham, P. (2003). War, lies, and videotape: Public diplomacy and the USA's war on terrorism. *Security Dialogue*, 34(4), 427–444.
- Wolf, J. C., & Rosen, B. (2004). *Public diplomacy: How to think about and improve it*. Rand Corporation.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

