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## Course and Instructor Information

**Course Number:** *AS.480.661.81* *International PR and Public Diplomacy*

**Semester and Course Duration:** *Spring 2022 (15 weeks)*

### Instructor Information

Instructor: M. Karen Walker, Ph.D.

Telephone Number: 1-703-625-1298 (cell)

Email Address: mkarenwalker@jhu.edu or mwalke74@jhu.edu

Office Hours: By appointment

Email and cell phone are the easiest ways to reach me.

### Course Information

**Credit Hours:** *3*

**Class Times:** *online*

**Course Prerequisites:** N/A

**Course Description:**

In today’s global world, reaching international audiences is a key function of U.S. government-funded public diplomacy programs, corporate public relations, and non-governmental organizations involved in relief and development. Through readings, lectures, discussions and exercises, this course examines the differences between domestic and international communication environments. Students develop communication skills needed to deliver messages and craft outreach strategies and programs for non-American audiences. Special attention is paid to communicating with audiences in Africa, Latin America and Asia. Topics include a historical overview of international public relations and public diplomacy, opportunities and challenges for today’s public diplomacy practitioner, using research to understand international audiences, writing effectively for international audiences, health and development communication, and communication in international conflict resolution. Students emerge with skills to work overseas in the fast-growing areas of public diplomacy and international public relations.

## About the Course

### Program Educational Objectives

When you successfully complete the program requirements, you will achieve these goals:

P1. Explain social science communication theories and their role in developing effective messaging

P3. Assess the effectiveness of communication messaging in diverse settings

P4. Develop effective content that mirrors real-world communication needs

### Course Educational Objectives

When you successfully complete the course, you will be able to:

C1. Navigate the international PR / public diplomacy landscape

* Explore the network of players in the public diplomacy enterprise
* Assess the practice and purpose amongst public diplomacy, public relations and stakeholder engagement
* Relate foreign policy issues and cultural values to public diplomacy strategies
* Understand how and why historical, political, social and economic contexts are important for effective international PR and public diplomacy

C2. Find your fit in the international PR field and public diplomacy enterprise

* + Adopt a normative stance toward the practice of international PR and public diplomacy
	+ Address trends and challenges for the scholar-practitioner
	+ Express your views on issues that are actively debated amongst public diplomacy and PR professionals
	+ Design a public diplomacy or good will campaign

C3. Explain the accrual and exercise of soft power influence

* Define soft power resources
* Explain how new and traditional public diplomacy tools promote national interests and values
* Conceptualize the creation and flow of global influence
* Assess how international actors convert soft power resources into influence

C4. Assess international PR and public diplomacy campaigns

* Identify tools and techniques for perception management
* Conceptualize the generation and use of social capital
* Evaluate public diplomacy strategies and international PR campaigns led by governmental and non-governmental actors

## Required Texts and Other Materials

### Textbooks: *There are no textbooks required for purchase for this course.*

Readings are available through E-Reserves and include:

Arceneaux, Phillip and Shawn Powers. “International Broadcasting: Public Diplomacy as a Game in a Marketplace of Loyalties.” In Nancy Snow and Nicholas J. Cull(Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, 2nd ed., (Pp. 50-63). New York, NY: 2020.

Bakry, Amal. “Cobranded Diplomacy: A Case Study of the British Council’s Branding of ‘Darwin Now’ in Egypt.” *International Journal of Communication* 14 (2020): 5108-5127.

Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. “Diasporas and Conflict Societies: Conflict Entrepreneurs, Competing Interests or Contributors to Stability and Development?” *Conflict, Security and Development* 11, no. 2 (2011): 115-143.

Brown, Robin. “The Politics of Relational Public Diplomacy.” In R.S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault and Ali Fisher (Eds.) *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*,” (Pp. 44-55). New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.

Campbell, Cathleen A. “U.S. Science Diplomacy with Arab Countries.” In Davis, L. S. and R. Patman (Eds.) *Science Diplomacy: New Day or False Dawn?* (Pp. 27-44). Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific Publishing, 2015.

Clark, Andrew M. and Thomas B. Christie. “Ready... Ready... Drop!: A Content Analysis of Coalition Leaflets Used in the Iraq War.” *International Communication Gazette* 67, no. 2 (2005): 141-154.

Copeland, Daryl. “Taking Diplomacy Public: Science, Technology and Foreign Ministries in a Heteropolar World.” In R.S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault and Ali Fisher (Eds.) *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*,” (Pp. 56-69). New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.

Cottle, Simon and David Nolan. “Global Humanitarianism and the Changing Aid-Media Field: ‘Everyone Was Dying for Footage’.” *Journalism Studies* 8, no. 6 (2007): 862-878.

Cowan, Geoffrey and Amelia Arsenault. “Moving from Monologue to Dialogue to Collaboration: Three Layers of Public Diplomacy.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (March 2008): 10-30.

Cull, Nicholas J. “Exchange and Education: The Soul of Public Diplomacy,” Chap. 5 in *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age*. Medford, MA: Polity Press, 2019.

⎯⎯⎯ “International Broadcasting: The Struggle for News,” Chap. 6 in *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age*. Medford, MA: Polity Press, 2019.

⎯⎯⎯ “Nation Brands and Branding,” Chap. 7 in *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age*. Medford, MA: Polity Press, 2019.

Edwards, Jason A. and Joseph M. Valenzano, III. “Bill Clinton’s ‘New Partnership’ Anecdote: Toward a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy Rhetoric.” *Journal of Language and Politics* 6, no. 3 (2007): 303-325.

Dale, Helle C. “Non-traditional Public Diplomacy in the Iraq-Afghan Wars or the Ups and Downs of Strategic Communicators.” In Deborah L. Trent (Ed.) *Nontraditional Public Diplomacy: Past, Present, and Future*” (Pp. 171-190). Washington, D.C.: Public Diplomacy Council, 2016.

Dinnie, Keith and Efe Sevin. “The Changing Nature of Nation Branding: Implications for Public Diplomacy.” In Nancy Snow and Nicholas J. Cull (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, 2nd ed., (Pp. 137-144). New York, NY: 2020.

Fisher, Ali. “Looking at the Man in the Mirror: Understanding of Power and Influence in Public Diplomacy.” In Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas (Eds.) *Trials of Engagement: The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy,* (Pp. 271-295). Boston, MA: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2011.

Fitzpatrick, Kathy R. “Public Diplomacy and Ethics: From Soft Power to Social Conscience.” In R.S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault and Ali Fisher (Eds.) *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*,” (Pp. 29-43). New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.
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Kennedy, Liam. “Diaspora and Diplomacy.” In *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, 2nd ed., edited by Nancy Snow and Nicholas J. Cull, 213-223. New York, NY: 2020.

Khan, M. Laeeq, et. al. “Public Engagement Model to Analyze Digital Diplomacy on Twitter: A Social Media Analytics Framework.” *International Journal of Communication* 15 (2021): 1741-1769.

Leach, Joan. “The Role of Science Communication in International Diplomacy.” In Davis, L. S. and R. Patman (Eds.) *Science Diplomacy: New Day or False Dawn?* (Pp. 155-169). Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific Publishing, 2015.
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Mueller, Sherry Lee. “The Nexus of US Public Diplomacy and Citizen Diplomacy.” In Nancy Snow and Nicholas J. Cull (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, 2nd ed., (Pp. 112-119). New York, NY: 2020.
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Ogawa, Tadashi. “New Frontiers in Relational Public Diplomacy: Collaborative Cultural Initiatives in Peace Building.” In R.S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault and Ali Fisher (Eds.) *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*,” (Pp. 117-131). New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.

Olins, Wally. “Making a National Brand.” In Jan Melissen (Ed.) *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International* Relations, (Pp. 169-179). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Plaisance, Patrick Lee. “The Propaganda War on Terrorism: An Analysis of the United States’ ‘Shared Values’ Public-Diplomacy Campaign After September 11, 2001.” Journal of Mass Media Ethics 20, no. 4 (2005): 250-268.

Powers, Matthew. “The Structural Organization of NGO Publicity Work: Explaining Divergent Publicity Strategies at Humanitarian and Human Rights Organizations.” *International Journal of Communication* 8 (2014): 90-107.

Quainton, Anthony C. E. “Public Diplomacy: Can It Be Defined?” In Deborah L. Trent (Ed.) *Nontraditional Public Diplomacy: Past, Present, and Future*,” (Pp. 25-41). Washington, D.C.: Public Diplomacy Council, 2016.
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⎯⎯⎯. “Soft Power, US Public Diplomacy and Global Risk.” In Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas(Eds.) *Trials of Engagement: The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy*, (Pp. 99-115). Boston, MA: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2011.

Sevin, Efe, Emily T. Metzgar and Craig Hayden, “The Scholarship of Public Diplomacy: Analysis of a Growing Field,” *International Journal of Communication* 13 (2019): 4814–4837.

Shahin, Saif and Q. Elyse Huang. “Friend, Ally, or Rival? Twitter Diplomacy as ‘Technosocial’ Performance of National Identity.” *International Journal of Communication* 13 (2019): 5100-5118.

Snow, Nancy. “On Being a Woman in Public Diplomacy: Some Personal Reflections.” *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. Published online 24 November, 2021. Accessed December 27, 2021 at [https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057%2Fs41254-021-00251-1](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41254-021-00251-1).

Szostek, Joanna. “What Happens to Public Diplomacy During Information War? Critical Reflections on the Conceptual Framing of International Communication.” *International Journal of Communication* 14 (2020): 2728-2748.

Taverner, Angus. “The Military Use of Soft Power ⎯ Information Campaigns: The Challenge of Application, their Audiences and Effects. In Inderjeet Parmar and Michael Cox (Eds.) *Soft Power and U.S. Foreign Policy: Theoretical, Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, (Pp. 152-164). New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.

Taylor, Philip M. “Public Diplomacy and the Information War on Terror.” In Inderjeet Parmar and Michael Cox (Eds.) *Soft Power and U.S. Foreign Policy: Theoretical, Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, (Pp. 165-181). New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.

White, Candace L. “Corporate Diplomacy.” In Nancy Snow and Nicholas J. Cull (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, 2nd ed., (Pp. 413-421). New York, NY: 2020.

Workneh, Téwodros W. “Journalistic Autonomy in Voice of America’s Amharic Service: Actors, Deterrents, and Safeguards.” *Journalism Studies* 21, no. 2 (2020): 217-235.

Wright, Scott and Will Higginbotham. “Delineating and Assessing Cultural Relations: The Case of Asialink.” *International Journal of Communication* 13 (2019): 1487-1506.
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### Specific Technology Requirements & Skills for this Course

This course requires the use of a computer that complies with the following hardware specifications:

* Access to a computer and reliable Internet service
* Head phone/microphone set
* Browsers: Chrome and Firefox for PCs; Safari for Mac computers

Learning online requires some basic knowledge of computer technology. At a minimum, you need to be able to:

* Navigate in and use Blackboard; the Blackboard Student Orientation course on your “My Institution” page
* Create, save and edit MS Word documents using tracked changes and comments; review MS Word training and tutorials for PC users (all versions); Word Help for Mac users
* Find basic resources on the Internet
* Create and organize files & folders on your computer
* Send, receive, and manage email

##

## Evaluation and Grading Policy

In the table below, you will find a brief description of the various course requirements including due dates assignment weights, and frequency.

| **Course Requirements** | **Assignment Value** | **Alignment with program and course objectives** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Weekly exercisesDue: 11:59 p.m. PT on last day of the module. | 15 x 5 =75 cumulative points |  P3, C1, C2, C3, C4 |
| Working definition of public diplomacyDue Date: 11:59 p.m. PT on February 8 | 10 points |  P1, C2 |
| Case study of a non-state actor’s soft power influenceDue Date: 11:59 p.m. on February 22 | 15 points |  P1, P3, C3, C4 |
| Case study of a government organization’s cultural or educational exchange programDue Date: 11:59 p.m. on March 18 | 15 points |  P1, P3, C3, C4 |
| Public diplomacy blog postDue Date: 11:59 p.m. on April 19 | 10 points |  P4, C2 |
| Literature reviewDue Date: 11:59 p.m. on April 26 | 30 points |  P1, C3, C4 |
| Public diplomacy or goodwill campaign planDue Date: 11:59 p.m. on May 3 | 15 points |  P4, C2 |
| Research paper (in lieu of final exam)Due Date: 11:59 p.m. on May 13 | 30 points |  P1, P4, C3, C4 |
| **Cumulative Points** | **200** |  |

### Grading

| **Letter Grade** | **Percentage** | **Points** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A | 94% to 100% | 188-200 |
| A- | 90% and less than 94% | 180-187 |
| B+ | 88% and less than 90% | 176-179 |
| B | 84% and less than 88% | 168-175 |
| B- | 80% and less than 84% | 160-167 |
| C | 70% and less than 80% | 140-159 |
| F | 0% and less than 70% | <140 |

Course Policies and Learner Expectations

**Communication Policies**

Texts and emails are the best way to communicate with me. I can respond to simple questions via email throughout the day; if your question requires a more detailed response, I will reply within 24 hours. Be concise; include a signature block; and double check attachments before you hit send. Additionally, you can post questions to the syllabus and assignments discussion forum. Please follow the Network Etiquette, i.e. “Netiquette” Core Rules, general guidelines for cyberspace behavior.

**Managing Due Dates**

Post completed written assignments through the TurnItIn Blackboard widget no later than 11:59 p.m. PT of the date due. Late assignments will be docked two points for each day overdue, absent extenuating circumstances. You may request an extension in advance of the due date to accommodate family and work commitments.

Weekly activities must be completed on time; students with an excused absence may make up lost points through an extra credit assignment negotiated with the instructor.

**Writing Guide**

Students are encouraged to adopt either APA or the Chicago Manual of Style for their written assignments.

**Structure of the Course**

The course is organized into 15 weekly modules or lessons.

Modules 1 through 4 introduce public diplomacy and international PR in the context of the 3Ds – diplomacy, defense and development.

Modules 5 through 13 explore a specific PD function: nation branding; educational exchange; cultural diplomacy; international broadcasting; digital diplomacy; science diplomacy; democracy promotion; commercial diplomacy; and Diaspora engagement.

Module 14 offers insight into public diplomacy research trends, specifically cross-disciplinary borrowings for theory and method.

Each lesson module will contain a selection of readings accompanied by a lecture, and an activity or exercise that each student can complete independently through online discussion or uploading his or her work to Blackboard.

Each weekly activity or exercise is valued at 5 points, prompting students to engage with online organizations and resources and maintain awareness of issues on the public diplomacy agenda. For example, students may be asked to explore and summarize information about an organization actively engaged in public diplomacy and international PR; review and comment on essays and policy briefs related to public diplomacy and international PR; or view and share highlights from a virtual event relevant to public diplomacy scholars and practitioners.

The activity for lesson 15 prompts each student’s personal reflection on the current and future state of public diplomacy scholarship and practice.

The weekly exercises will be teed up and managed through Blackboard as the course progresses, typically one or two weeks in advance. Because the weekly exercises are more responsive to current events, they may not precisely align with theme or function of public diplomacy under study for the given week.

**Assignments**

The course entails seven written assignments. Collectively, the assignments enable students to demonstrate their creativity and breadth of their writing skills.

* Draft a **working definition of public diplomacy** (10 points). In this assignment, students will construct a working definition to use throughout the course, which compares and contrasts strengths and limitations of existing definitions and connects the working definition to the student’s point of view.
* **Case study of a non-state actor’s soft power campaign** (15 points). In this assignment, students will work back and forth between theory and practice, presenting a written critique of a soft power campaign conducted by an NGO, multinational corporation, academic institution or international organization. Students should obtain the instructor’s advance approval of the case study selection.
* **Case study of a government organization’s cultural or educational exchange program** (15 points). In this assignment, students will critique a government organization’s past or current cultural or educational exchange program or campaign, addressing the intended audience, goal, design, implementation and benefits. The student should obtain the instructor’s advance approval of the case study selection.
* **Public diplomacy blog post** (10 points). In this assignment, students will draft a blog post on a topic or theme of their choosing suitable to submit to the [CPD Blog](https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/newswire/cpdblog_main).
* **Campaign plan** (15 points). In this assignment, students will select a government organization or NGO as a “client,” with the instructor’s advance approval, to prepare a planning document for a new public diplomacy initiative or good will campaign.
* **Literature review** (30 points) and **research paper** (30 points). The research paper takes the place of a final exam. In this assignment, the student will advance an innovation in public diplomacy tradecraft to meet a challenge or opportunity identified in the peer-reviewed literature or practitioner forums. Instructor consultation on the proposed innovation is encouraged.

To prepare for the research paper, students will submit a list of 10 scholarly essays, journal articles or book chapters, each with the student’s own abstract (i.e., each earns up to 3 points) as an early start on the literature review. Points will be earned only for sources not covered in the weekly readings.

I reserve the right to modify the course schedule by adding or deleting the learning materials, and to modify due dates, or add or delete assignments. These changes will be beneficial or necessary to help you achieve the course goals or to mitigate unforeseen circumstances. I will notify you of any changes through Blackboard Announcements and email.

**Discussion Forums**

In the first week of class, students are invited to introduce themselves to their classmates in an ungraded “ice breaker” discussion forum. Other discussion forums and threads are generated to support the weekly exercises. A discussion forum for questions about the syllabus, assignments and administrivia will also be available to students.

University Policies

**General**. This course adheres to all University policies described in the academic catalog. Please pay close attention to the following policies:

**Students with Disabilities**. Johns Hopkins University is committed to providing reasonable and appropriate accommodations to students with disabilities. Students with documented disabilities should contact the coordinator listed on the Disability Accommodations page. Further information and a link to the Student Request for Accommodation form can also be found on the Disability Accommodations page.

**Ethics & Plagiarism**. JHU Ethics Statement: The strength of the university depends on academic and personal integrity. In this course, you must be honest and truthful. Ethical violations include cheating on exams, plagiarism, reuse of assignments, improper use of the Internet and electronic devices, unauthorized collaboration, alteration of graded assignments, forgery and falsification, lying, facilitating academic dishonesty, and unfair competition. Report any violations you witness to the instructor. Read and adhere to JHU’s Notice on Plagiarism.

**Dropping the Course**. You are responsible for understanding the university’s policies and procedures regarding withdrawing from courses found in the current catalog. You should be aware of the current deadlines according to the Academic Calendar.

**Getting Help**. You have a variety of methods to get help on Blackboard. Please consult the resource listed in the "Blackboard Help" link for important information. If you encounter technical difficulty in completing or submitting any online assessment, please immediately contact the designated help desk listed on the AAP online support page. Also, contact your instructor at the email address listed in the syllabus.

**Copyright Policy**. All course materials are the property of JHU and are to be used for the student's individual academic purpose only. Any dissemination, copying, reproducing, modification, displaying, or transmitting of any course material content for any other purpose is prohibited, will be considered misconduct under the JHU Copyright Compliance Policy, and may be cause for disciplinary action. Encouraging academic dishonesty or cheating by distributing information about course materials or assignments which would give an unfair advantage to others may violate AAP’s Code of Conduct and the University’s Student Conduct Code.

Specifically, recordings, course materials, and lecture notes may not be exchanged or distributed for commercial purposes, for compensation, or for any purpose other than use by students enrolled in the class. Other distributions of such materials by students may be deemed to violate the above University policies and be subject to disciplinary action.

**Code of Conduct**. To better support all students, the Johns Hopkins University non-academic Student Conduct Code has been integrated and updated to include all divisions of the University. In addition, it is important to note that all AAP students are still accountable for the Code of Conduct for Advanced Academic Programs.

**Title IX Confidentiality and Mandatory Reporting**. As an instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help create a safe and inclusive learning environment on our campus. I also have mandatory reporting responsibilities related to my role as a Responsible Employee under the Sexual Misconduct Policy & Procedures (which prohibits sexual harassment, sexual assault, relationship violence and stalking), as well as the General Anti-Harassment Policy (which prohibits all types of protected status based discrimination and harassment).

It is my goal that you feel able to share information related to your life experiences in classroom discussions, in your written work, and in our one-on-one meetings. I will seek to keep information you share private to the greatest extent possible. However, I am required to share information that I learn of regarding sexual misconduct, as well as protected status based harassment and discrimination, with the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE).

For a list of individuals/offices who can speak with you confidentially, please see Appendix B of the JHU Sexual Misconduct Policies and Laws. For more information on both policies mentioned above, please see: JHU Relevant Policies, Codes, Statements and Principles. Please also note that certain faculty and other University community members also have a duty as a designated Campus Safety Authority under the Clery Act to notify campus security of certain crimes, as well as a duty under State law and University policy to report suspected child abuse and/or neglect.

**Course Schedule**

*Lesson 1- The Public Diplomacy Enterprise*

*January 24 – February 1*

This week’s learning objectives are to define public diplomacy; gain historical context for the public diplomacy mission; and become familiar with the organizations and programs that constitute the public diplomacy enterprise.

* Introduce yourself to your classmates through the Ice Breaker Blackboard discussion forum.
* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Geoffrey Cowan and Amelia Arsenault, “Moving from Monologue to Dialogue to Collaboration.”

Ali Fisher, “Looking at the Main the Mirror.”

Anthony C. E. Quainton, “Public Diplomacy: Can It Be Defined?”

* Weekly activity: Introduce an individually assigned organization that belongs to the public diplomacy enterprise to your classmates through a Blackboard discussion forum. Provide the “5Ws”: **what** the organization or entity does; **who** leads it and **whom** it serves or benefits; **where** it operates (does it have a particular geographic focus such as sub-Saharan Africa or the Middle East, or does it have a global reach?); **when** it was founded – describe what was happening at the time and the organization’s “origin story”; and **why** it belongs in the public diplomacy enterprise. Also explain **how** it performs its mission – whether it specializes in a particular type or function of public diplomacy.

*Lesson 2- Soft Power*

*February 2 – 8*

This week’s learning objectives are to become conversant in soft power theory; make appropriate distinctions between hard and soft power resources; and explore ways in which organizations translate soft power resources into influence.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Kathy Fitzpatrick, “Public Diplomacy and Ethics.”

Geun Lee and Kadir Ayhan, “Why Do We Need Non-State Actors in Public Diplomacy?”

Joseph Nye, “Public Diplomacy and Soft Power.”

Giles Scott-Smith, “Soft Power, US Public Diplomacy and Global Risk.”

* Weekly activity: Watch Joseph Nye Jr.’s [soft power oration](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GAOeQFPLKMU), delivered November 22, 2021. Share your reactions with your classmates through a Blackboard discussion forum (responding to each one of five discussion prompts / questions).
* Submit your working definition of public diplomacy, due February 8 at 11:59 p.m. PT.
* Consult with the instructor (Zoom or phone conversation preferred) to select a case study for a non-state actor’s soft-power influence campaign.

*Lesson 3- Intersections with national defense*

*February 9 - 15*

This week’s learning objectives are to trace the evolution from soft to smart power; and to become familiar with diplomatic, informational, military and economic (DIME) tools employed for conflict prevention and stability operations.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Andrew M. Clark and Thomas B. Christie, “Ready … Ready … Drop!”

Helle Dale, “Non-traditional Public Diplomacy in the Iraq-Afghan Wars.”

Joanna Szostek, “What Happens to Public Diplomacy During Information War?”

Angus Taverner, “The Military Use of Soft Power ⎯ Information Campaigns.”

Philip M. Taylor, “Public Diplomacy and the Information War on Terror.”

* Weekly Activity: In 2006, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington, DC-based think tank, published [CSIS Commission on Smart Power: A Smarter, More Secure America](https://carnegieendowment.org/files/csissmartpowerreport.pdf), a study co-chaired by Nye and Richard Armitage. In their introduction, Nye and Armitage make four recommendations (Pp. 11-12).

Lesson 3 Weekly Activity, cont.

Select on one of the four recommendations. Assess and revise the recommendation to bring it into today’s context, relating your commentary to the critical focus areas listed on page 5 of the report: alliances, partnerships and institutions; global development and public health; public diplomacy; economic integration; and technology and innovation. Each critical focus area will be developed as a thread in the week’s discussion forum.

*Lesson 4- Intersections with international development*

*February 16 - 22*

This week’s learning objectives are to understand the interplay of public diplomacy, international PR and development communication; and to understand how development officers and non-governmental organizations leverage and employ public diplomacy resources to achieve their programmatic goals.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Robin Brown, “The Politics of Relational Public Diplomacy.”

Simon Cottle and David Nolan. “Global Humanitarianism.”

Matthew Powers, “The Structural Organization of NGO Publicity Work.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.
* Submit your case study of a non-state actor’s soft power influence campaign, due February 22 at 11:59 p.m. PT.

*Lesson 5- Nation Branding*

*February 23 – March 1*

This week’s learning objectives are to identify tools and techniques employed in placemaking and to understand how nations seek to improve their global standing through image and reputation management.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Nicholas Cull, “Nation Brands and Branding.”

Keith Dinnie and Efe Sevin, “The Changing Nature of Nation Branding.”

Florian Kaefer, “Country Branding.”

Wally Olins, “Making a National Brand.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity. Note: this module’s theme aligns well with the Winter 2022 Olympics, which will have concluded the week prior and will likely be the focus of the weekly activity.

*Lesson 6- Educational Exchange*

*March 2 – 8*

This week’s learning objectives are to gain in-depth knowledge of the history, purposes, benefits and limitations of educational, professional and technical exchange programs; and to become familiar with the organizations that conduct these programs.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Nicholas Cull, “Exchange and Education.”

Gilles Scott-Smith, “Exchange Programs and Public Diplomacy.”

Kyung Sun Lee and Diana Ingenhoff, “Cultural Mediation in International Exchange Programs.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.
* Initiate consultation with the instructor (Zoom or phone conversation preferred) to select a case study for a government organization’s cultural or educational exchange program.

*Lesson 7- Cultural Diplomacy*

*March 9 - 15*

This week’s learning objective is to gain in-depth knowledge of the purposes, benefits, limitations and organizations engaged in cultural exchange programs, museum diplomacy and people-to-people diplomacy.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Amal Bakry, “Co-branded Diplomacy.”

Teck Fann Goh, “Emergence of Japanese Film Festivals.”

Sherry Lee Mueller, “The Nexus of US Public Diplomacy and Citizen Diplomacy.”

Tadashi Ogawa, “New Frontiers in Relational Public Diplomacy.”

Cynthia P. Schneider, “Culture Communicates: U.S. Diplomacy that Works.”

Scott Wright and Will Higginbotham, “Delineating and Assessing Cultural Relations.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.

*Lesson 8- International Broadcasting*

*March 16 – 29 (encompasses spring break, March 21-27)*

This week’s learning objectives are to gain in-depth knowledge of the history, purposes, benefits and limitations of international broadcasting programs and to become familiar with the governance structure for U.S. international broadcasting.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Phillip Arceneaux and Shawn Powers, “International Broadcasting.”

Nicholas Cull, “International Broadcasting.”

Téwodros W. Workneh, “Journalistic Autonomy in VOA’s Amharic Service.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.
* Submit your case study of a government organization’s cultural or educational exchange program, due March 18 at 11:59 p.m. PT (before you go on spring break).

*Lesson 9- Digital Diplomacy*

*March 30 – April 5*

This week we continue our study of international broadcasting with a focus on social media and also consider digital diplomacy strategies and initiatives to advance public diplomacy goals.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Nisha Garud-Patkar, “Factors Influencing National Reputation of India.”

Miriam Hernández and Dani Madrid-Morales, “Diversifying Voice, Democratizing the News?”

Huang, Q. Elyse, “Facebook Not Statebook.”

Huang, Zhao Alexandre and Rui Wang, “Building a Network to ‘Tell China Stories Well’.”

Khan et al, “Public Engagement Model to Analyze Digital Diplomacy on Twitter.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.

*Lesson 10- Science Diplomacy*

*April 6 - 12*

This week’s learning objectives are to define the three dimensions of science diplomacy and to gain in-depth knowledge of the history, purposes, benefits, limitations and organizations engaged in science diplomacy.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Cathleen A. Campbell, “U.S. Science Diplomacy with Arab Countries.”

Daryl Copeland, “Taking Diplomacy Public.”

Jong-on Hahm, “Funding International Scientific Research Activities.”

Joan Leach, “The Role of Science Communication in International Diplomacy.”

Scott C. Ratzan, “Advancing Global Health Diplomacy.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.
* Consult with the instructor (Zoom or phone preferred) on your ideas for your international PR or public diplomacy campaign plan and your research paper topic. Note that these two assignments can be mutually reinforcing, representing two dimensions of the same topic.

*Lesson 11- Democracy Promotion*

*April 13 – 19*

This week’s learning objectives are to distinguish exemplary and interventionist forms of national exceptionalism; and to gain in-depth knowledge of the history, purposes, benefits, limitations and organizations engaged in democracy promotion.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Jason Edwards and Joseph M. Valenzano, “Bill Clinton’s ‘New Partnership’ Anecdote.”

Patrick Plaisance, “An Analysis of the ‘Shared Values’ Public Diplomacy Campaign.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.
* Submit your blog post, due April 19 at 11:59 p.m. PT.

*Lesson 12- Commercial Diplomacy*

*April 20 - 26*

This week’s learning objectives are to gain in-depth knowledge of commercial diplomacy and advocacy tools and resources and to explore how commercial diplomacy and public-private partnerships advance corporate social responsibility.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Candace L. White, “Corporate Diplomacy.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.
* Submit your literature review — abstracts of 10 scholarly essays, journal articles or book chapters — that you will incorporate in your research paper. Due April 26 at 11:59 p.m. PT. Each abstract is valued at 3 points, earned only for sources not covered in the weekly readings.

*Lesson 13- Diaspora Engagement*

*April 27 – May 3*

This week’s learning objectives are to become familiar with Diaspora studies as an academic discipline; to understand the role of Diaspora communities as international actors who accrue and use soft power; and to explore Diaspora engagement as a facet of public diplomacy and international public relations.

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Jennifer Brinkerhoff, “Diasporas and Conflict Societies.”

Liam Kennedy, “Diaspora and Diplomacy.”

Kishan S. Rana, “Diaspora Diplomacy and Public Diplomacy.”

R.S. Zaharna, “The Public Diplomacy Challenges of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.
* Submit your public diplomacy or goodwill campaign plan, due May 3 at 11:59 p.m.

*Lesson 14- Public Diplomacy Scholarship*

*May 4 - 10*

* Watch the lecture and complete the readings:

Eytan Gilboa, “Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy.”

Efe Sevin, Emily T. Metzgar and Craig Hayden, “The Scholarship of Public Diplomacy.”

Fatemeh Shafiee Sarvestani, et. al., “Israeli Public Diplomacy Toward the United States.”

Saif Shahin and Q. Elyse Huang, “Friend, Ally or Rival?”

Nancy Snow, “On Being a Woman in Public Diplomacy.”

* Check the Blackboard lesson folder for the weekly activity.

*Lesson 15- Future Directions*

*May 11 - 15*

* Weekly activity: Reflect on the current and future state of public diplomacy scholarship and practice in the Blackboard discussion forum.
* Submit your research paper, due May 13 at 11:59 p.m.

### Major Assignment Guidelines

Writing Assignment #1: Working Definition of Public Diplomacy

Due Date: February 8 at 11:59 p.m. PT

Points: 10

Prompt: Construct a working definition of public diplomacy as your touchstone for the course. In ~750 words (three pages, Ariel 12 double-spaced): cite, compare and contrast definitions encountered in the readings and online research; explain how each influenced your own definition; connect your definition to your goals and point of view.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria  | Fully successful2 points | Partially Successful1 point |
| Thoroughness | Fully interrogates 4-5 published definitions. | Fully interrogates 1-3 published definitions. |
| Sensitivity | Presents the working definition as both a personal choice and a strategic choice aligned with an enduring goal or purpose of public diplomacy. | Describes how the working definition is suitable to a specific task or set of circumstances. |
| Clarity | Claims are clear, logical, supported and mutually reinforcing. | Claims are clear and logical. |
| Understanding | Breadth and depth: addresses strengths and limitations of the published definitions based on multiple criteria (e.g., scope, precision, utility). | Depth: Fully compares and contrasts definitions based on a single criterion. |
| Convincingness | The reader agrees fully with the student’s rationale for the working definition presented.  | The reader questions the student’s choice and rationale. |

Writing Assignment #2:

Case Study of a Non-State Actors’ Soft Power Influence Campaign

Due Date: February 22 at 11:59 p.m. PT

Points: 15

Prompt: Working back and forth between theory and practice, present a written critique of a soft power campaign conducted by a national or international non-governmental organization, multinational corporation or academic institution of your choosing, with the instructor’s advance approval. Your critique should be 750-900 words (three to four pages, Arial 12, double spaced).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria  | Fully Successful3 points | Partially Successful2 points | Needs Work1 point |
| Reading theory | Addresses soft power’s evolution and how it works from multiple perspectives, including its critics. | Addresses the evolution and explanatory force of soft power as proposed by Nye. | Describes soft power theory in general terms. |
| Context | Demonstrates full understanding of the selected actor’s history, current operating environment and trajectory. | Demonstrates full understanding of the actor’s current operating environment. | Demonstrates a partial understanding of the non-state actor’s operating environment. |
| Clarity | Claims are clear, logical, mutually reinforcing, evidence-based and appropriately attributed. | Claims are clear, logical and mutually reinforcing but lack supporting evidence and attribution.  | Individual claims are clear and logical, but contradictory. |
| Inference-making | Generates credible hypotheses and scenarios regarding the non-state actor’s capacity to translate soft power resources into global influence. | Addresses the non-state actor’s capacity to generate and exercise soft power. | Argument relies exclusively on historical examples and the non-state actor’s past performance. |
| Quality of critique | Delves into subtext of the campaign, offering nuanced judgment of its effectiveness, impact and constitutive force. | Critique focuses exclusively on persuasive effects. | Critique is descriptive, offering little to no insight.  |

Writing Assignment #3:

Case Study of a Government Organization’s Cultural or Educational Exchange Program

Due Date: March 18 at 11:59 p.m. PT

Points: 15

Prompt: In this assignment, you will focus on a government organization’s past or current educational or cultural exchange program of your choosing, with the instructor’s advance approval. Present a written critique of the campaign’s intended audience, intent, design, implementation and overall effectiveness. Your critique should be 750-900 words (three to four pages, Arial 12, double spaced).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria  | Fully successful3 points | Partially Successful2 points | Needs Work1 point |
| Audience | The critique addresses segments of the primary audience plus secondary audiences or participants. | The critique addresses segments of the primary audience or participant group. | The critique addresses the audience or participant group as a single entity. |
| Context | Demonstrates full understanding of the selected organization’s mission, track record, operating context and stakeholders.  | Demonstrates full understanding of the selected organization’s mission and operating context. | Demonstrates a partial understanding of the organization’s mission and operating context. |
| Clarity | Claims are clear, logical, mutually reinforcing, evidence-based and appropriately attributed. | Claims are clear, logical and mutually reinforcing but lack supporting evidence and attribution.  | Individual claims are clear and logical, but contradictory. |
| Thoroughness | The critique fully addresses audience, goals, messaging, implementation and evaluation with suggestions for further enhancements. | The critique fully addresses at least 3 campaign elements (e.g., audience, goals, messaging, implementation, evaluation). | The author presents an accurate but cursory critique of the campaign. |
| Quality of critique | Delves into subtext of the campaign, offering nuanced judgment of its adherence to public diplomacy’s state-of-the-art / best practices. | Critique focuses exclusively on the organization’s tactical objectives. | Critique is descriptive, offering little to no insight.  |

Writing Assignment #4: CPD Blog Post

Due Date: April 19 at 11:59 p.m. PT

Points: 10

Prompt: Draft a blog post on a topic or theme of your choosing suitable to submit to the [CPD Blog](https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/newswire/cpdblog_main). Your post should be between 900 and 1,000 words.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria  | Fully successful2 points | Partially Successful1 point |
| Timeliness | The blog post addresses a topic that is on the public agenda and/or actively discussed in social media channels. | The blog addresses a topic that has been overtaken by events or is no longer actively discussed in news and social media. |
| Salience | The blog post addresses a need or problem that a public diplomacy practitioner could meet or solve; public diplomacy is reflected in the blog title, introduction and conclusion. | The blog post addresses an issue that would be difficult for a public diplomacy practitioner to influence.  |
| Clarity | The blog post hangs together and rings true. | The blog post lacks coherence and convincingness.  |
| Sourcing | URLs are embedded as in-text hyperlinks; academic-style lists, footnotes or endnotes are incorporated directly into the text. | Information sources are ambiguous or unattributed. |
| Good writing | The blog post is publication-ready\* requiring minimal copy editing and proofing edits. | The blog post contains grammatical, spelling and other errors that would reflect poorly on the author and his/her institution. |

\* Students trained in news writing are encouraged to follow AP Style, as noted in the CPD [submission guidelines](https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/page/cpd-blog-submission-guidelines). Students unfamiliar with AP style may follow their preferred academic style manual for grading purposes.

Writing Assignment #5: Abstracts

Due Date: April 26 at 11:59 p.m. PT

Points: 30

Prompt: Submit a list of 10 scholarly essays, journal articles or book chapters, each with your own abstract, as an early start on the literature review for your research paper.

Each abstract is valued at 3 points for the following criteria:

* The source is peer reviewed and/or authoritative.
* The abstract addresses the item’s significance and relevance to the agreed-upon research topic.
* The abstract is 150-200 words, readable and easily recounted

Points will be earned only for sources not covered in the weekly readings.

Writing Assignment #6: Campaign Plan

Due Date: May 3 at 11:59 p.m. PT

Points: 15

Prompt: Prepare a planning document for a new public diplomacy or good will campaign for governmental or non-governmental organization as your “client,” with the instructor’s advance approval. The plan should present a problem that can be solved or an opportunity that can be seized through collaborative public diplomacy programming and expertise.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria  | Fully Successful3 Points | Partially Successful2 points | Needs Improvement1 point |
| Context | Demonstrates full understanding of the selected organization’s history, mission or purpose, current operating environment and trajectory. | Demonstrates full understanding of the organization’s mission and current operating environment. | Demonstrates a partial understanding of the organization’s mission and operations. |
| Goal | The plan presents a problem or opportunity that is salient to the organization, well defined and based in evidence. | The plan presents a problem or opportunity that is salient to the organization and well defined. | The plan presents a problem or opportunity that is salient to the organization. |
| Strategies and Tactics | Strategies are well defined, within the organization’s mandate, and crafted to maximize audience (or participant) reach and resonance. | Strategies are well defined and within the organization’s mandate. | Strategies are within the organization’s mandate. |
| Collaboration | The plan identifies potential partners who offer a wide spectrum of experience, resources and expertise, and a value proposition for their participation in the campaign. | The plan identifies potential partners in multiple sectors who could offer resources and expertise, but lacks specificity on how and why they would join the campaign. | The plan references partnering strategies but fails to identify prospective organizations to join the campaign. |
| Impact  | The plan gives the organization a reason to act; a clear strategy; and confidence that the campaign will work.  | The plan gives the organization a reason to act and a clear strategy. | The plan gives the organization a reason to act but is generally unpersuasive. |

Writing Assignment #7: The Research Paper (in lieu of a final exam)

Due Date: May 13 at 11:59 p.m. PT

Points: 30

Prompt: Make the case for an innovative approach to public diplomacy tradecraft that meets a challenge identified in the peer-reviewed literature or practitioner forums. The research paper should be 10-12 pages double spaced, excluding references and appendices. You may use the style guide with which you’re most comfortable, preferably APA or Chicago.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria  | Fully successful5 points | Partially successful3 points | Needs Improvement1 point |
| Context | Provides a clear thesis statement; the challenge or opportunity is well defined, addressing its historical context as well as its present context and stakeholders. | Provides a clear thesis statement; the challenge or opportunity is well defined and put into current context. | Provides a clear thesis statement. |
| Motivating action | Demonstrates awareness of PD practitioners’ operational challenges and constraints. Action steps to adopt the proposed innovation are clear and feasible. The author also manages practitioners’ expectations for success. | Demonstrates awareness of PD practitioners’ operational challenges. Action steps to adopt the proposed innovation are clear.  | Demonstrates awareness of PD practitioners’ operational challenges. |
| Literature Review | The literature review is authoritative and relevant to the problem / opportunity; integrated into the paper; and easy for a practitioner to understand. | The literature review is authoritative and salient to the field. | The literature review is authoritative. |
| Structure | The paper explains how things are done today and the limits of current practice; why an innovation is needed; the consequences of doing nothing; why the proposed innovation will succeed; and if adopted, the difference it will make for the discipline and society.  | The paper explains how things are done today and the limits of current practice; why an innovation is needed; and why the proposed innovation will succeed. | The paper describes current practice and its limitations. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria cont. | Fully successful5 points | Partially successful3 points | Needs Improvement1 point |
| Argument | Generates credible hypotheses and scenarios that inform the proposed innovation. The author uses a variety of persuasive techniques and evidence for claims, making his or her assumptions and inferences explicit. The reader understands the proposed approach and supporting rationale.  | The paper is descriptive, with a narrow / shallow evidence base. The reader understands the proposed approach and supporting rationale. | The paper is purely descriptive and lacks an evidence base. The reader understands the proposed approach, but rationale is unclear or missing.  |
| Clarity | Claims are clear, logical, mutually reinforcing, evidence-based and appropriately attributed. | Claims are clear, logical and mutually reinforcing but lack supporting evidence and attribution.  | Individual claims are clear and logical, but contradictory. |