Many Voices, Many Hands: Widening Participatory Dialogue to Improve Diplomacy's Impact

By Deborah L. Trent

La Diplomatie Publique

الدبلوماسية العامة

Общественная дипломатия

Public Diplomacy

PUBLICZNA DYPLOMACJA

הסברה

Publieksdiplomatie

Diplomacia Pública

公共外交

Δημόσια Διπλωματία

Публична дипломация

Many Voices, Many Hands: Widening Participatory Dialogue to Improve Diplomacy's Impact

Deborah L. Trent

May 2018
Figueroa Press
Los Angeles

MANY VOICES, MANY HANDS:
WIDENING PARTICIPATORY DIALOGUE
TO IMPROVE DIPLOMACY'S IMPACT

by Deborah L. Trent

Guest Editor
Vivian S. Walker
Faculty Fellow, USC Center on Public Diplomacy

About the USC Center on Public Diplomacy

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD) was established in 2003 as a partnership between the Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism and the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. It is a research, analysis and professional education organization dedicated to furthering the study and practice of global public engagement and cultural relations.

Since its inception, CPD has become a productive and recognized leader in the public diplomacy research and scholarship community. Having benefited from international support within academic, corporate, governmental and public policy circles, it is now the definitive go-to destination for practitioners and international leaders in public diplomacy, while pursuing an innovative research agenda.

USC received the 2008 Benjamin Franklin Award for Public Diplomacy from the U.S. State Department in recognition of the university's teaching, training and research in public diplomacy.

CPD's Mission

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy seeks to advance and enrich the study and practice of public diplomacy through research, professional education and public engagement.

CPD Perspectives

CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy is a periodic publication by the USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD), that highlights scholarship intended to stimulate critical thinking about the study and practice of public diplomacy.

Designed for both the practitioner and the scholar, this series illustrates the breadth of public diplomacy—its role as an essential component of international relations and the intellectual challenges it presents to those seeking to understand this increasingly significant factor in global society.

CPD Perspectives is available electronically in PDF form on CPD's website (www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org) and in hard copy by request.

For general inquiries and to request additional copies of this paper, please contact:

USC Center on Public Diplomacy at the Annenberg School
University of Southern California
3502 Watt Way, Suites 232-234
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0281
Tel: (213) 821-2078; Fax: (213) 821-0774
cpd@usc.edu

Many Voices, Many Hands: Widening Participatory Dialogue to Improve Diplomacy's Impact[1]

Dedicated to public and citizen diplomats in global villages everywhere

Abstract

Public-private partnerships (P3s) are at the heart of public and citizen diplomacy. This paper offers a qualitative impact evaluation of one nationally funded and two city-level P3s engaging ethnically diverse diasporas. The evaluation demonstrates the cost-effectiveness of partnering across the private and voluntary sectors. It shows how a relational approach to strategic engagement and program design, monitoring and evaluation that includes dialogic, participatory communication improves credibility, sustainability and future program planning. The paper argues that enjoining program stakeholders across government, nonprofits, local communities and the private sector promotes a culture of research and evaluation in diplomacy's public dimension and that rigorous impact analysis is essential for advocating future financial and in-kind resources.

Introduction

Around the world, U.S. public diplomacy and citizen diplomacy foster cooperation, coexistence and peace among state and non-state actors across civil society and the private sector. The Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961—governing cultural and educational exchanges of the U.S. Department of State—put public-private partnership (P3) on the menu of public and citizen diplomacy engagement processes.[2,3] It has been a favorite course ever since. This study aims to demonstrate the feasibility of a multi-stakeholder participatory approach to strategic engagement and design, monitoring and evaluation (DME) for P3s. It suggests that the participatory DME approach and impact evaluation results bolster potential for sustainability of outcomes, impacts, funding and expansion.

Strategic diplomatic engagement using citizen and public diplomacy P3s that are rigorously planned, implemented and evaluated serves global-to-local (a.k.a. "glocal") interests. This study develops a set of measurable strategic-engagement communication practices, demonstrating them in an impact evaluation of three U.S.-based P3s: sister city partnerships between Chicago, Illinois and Kyiv, Ukraine; between Montgomery County, Maryland and Morazán, El Salvador; and the U.S. Department of State Agency for International Development-supported International diaspora Engagement Alliance (IdEA). The practices operationalize these partnerships' characteristics of mutuality, dialogue, relationship-building and hands-on collaboration. The cases of Chicago-Kyiv, Montgomery County-Morazán and IdEA also showcase the growing number of diverse publics who want to participate in public and citizen diplomacy in their U.S. localities and heritage countries.

Context and Process in Strategic Engagement[4]

U.S. diplomatists must not only "inform, influence, and understand global publics" but "increasingly...*engage with*

them in relationships that promote national interests."[5] This relationship-centric approach also applies to subnational diplomacy expressed in city-to-city and community-level citizen diplomacy featuring cultural, educational and economic development. Several overarching contextual and process variables frame this three-case study of strategic relationship-building, partnering and evaluation in public and citizen diplomacy.[6] The context includes the complexities of national and subnational diplomacy because of globalization, rising power of diverse non-state actors, and the challenges in translating strategy to programs. Key diplomatic processes for DME in such a context are cross-sector partnering, mediating and dialogic, participatory communication.

Contextual Variables

Contextual variables are the sociopolitical and historical conditions underlying and motivating a P3.[7,8,9] One contextual variable is today's complex diplomacy with non-state actors, now central in government-to-government international relations.[10] Among these non-state global publics are diasporas, "self-identifying members of 'ethnic minority groups of migrant origins residing and acting in host countries but maintaining strong sentimental and material links with their countries of origin...'"[11]

Generally, diasporans' cross-cultural competencies motivate a "sense of moral co-responsibility" to the original and adopted nations.[12,13] Diasporan diversity and sensibility lend perspective for setting subnational and national domestic—as well as foreign policy—agendas, from negotiating cultural exhibitions between city museums to trade agreements among nations.[14,15,16,17] Especially with relatively young members of a diaspora, there is increasing anecdotal evidence that those who volunteer in heritage-country development programs tend toward long-term

engagement for purposes of diplomacy, business[18] or even (re)establishing residency.[19] While creating transnational, cross-sector partnerships conceived through shared interests, practitioners of diplomacy among diasporas should not assume their cultural competency and dedication, as dated experience and particularistic interests or affiliations in the heritage country can sometimes distract volunteers from project goals.[20]

Another contextual variable is "strategic engagement" itself. Here, strategic engagement through P3 emphasizes inclusive participation of concerned publics in problem-focused interactions and projects that "walk the rhetorical talk" of mutual understanding and collaboration and sincerely engage diverse publics such as ethnic diasporas[21] to improve strategic planning[22] and measuring of diplomatic outputs, outcomes and impacts. In this context, diasporans are "strategic publics" with relevant glocal perspectives and experience for effective engagement around a mutually conceived, specific policy problem or need.[23,24]

The Partnership for Lebanon—initiated by President George W. Bush—and the P3 comprised of the U.S. Department of State, American Task Force for Lebanon, Marshall Legacy Institute, Lebanese Army and University of Balamand engaged diasporan cultural and technical acumen, commitment and fundraising capacity.[25,26,27] Assisting in post-conflict infrastructure rebuilding, training and survivor rehabilitation needs after the 2006 Hezbollah-Israel War and 1975-1990 Civil War, these partnerships strengthened strained U.S.-Lebanon relations, their tangible humanitarian results reflecting favorably on the U.S. government.[28]

The Partnership for Lebanon and American Task Force for Lebanon, *inter alia*, worked collaboratively and strategically in the midst of regional conflict to select and execute projects that met vital local needs and partner interests while

leveraging soft power.[29] These examples of cross-sector information-sharing including strategic diasporan publics show that "culture influences both relationship-building and collaborative diplomatic processes....[since] 'cultural and ethnic diversity are the biggest sources of friction—and synergy—in collaborative teams.'"[30]

Process Variables

Process variables are behaviors of partners and lead stakeholders affecting how P3s are conceived, implemented and sustained (a.k.a. "managed").[31,32,33] Three overarching process variables are: cross-sector partnering, mediating and dialogic, participatory communication. The latter two integrate DME, informed by international development practice.

Public-private partnering's strategic value stems from government willingness to cede some control to nonprofit, private-sector and community-based partners and, through the economic and soft power of those partners, leverage resources to share risk, gaining credibility from better-informed policy and programs.[34,35] The projects described above effectively executed Lebanese-U.S. diaspora engagement via P3. P3 with diaspora engagement is a recent practice to create community transnationally, with many diaspora-sending countries collaborating with emigrants beyond utilizing their financial remittances.[36,37]

The second process variable—mediating by diplomatists and other lead stakeholders—has five major dimensions:

1. Administering new and expanded relationships.[38,39]

2. Negotiating, representing and managing "mediatization" forces because of increasingly advancing and accessible communication technologies.[40]

3.   Providing conflict mediation.

4.   Providing city-to-city, cross-border cooperation.

5.   Integrating project DME from the outset of project planning.

The third process variable marries eight genuine dialogue and 15 participatory communication practices to mediate the diversity of stakeholder experience and perspectives in strategic engagement. Genuine dialogue connotes mutual, deliberative, "power-free" decision-making[41] to navigate complicated global networks of communities with shared and divergent interests. Participatory communication aids diplomatists in identifying with whom to engage strategically, as well as relationally among global publics, while also drawing insights from stakeholder management and corporate social responsibility.[42]

Many of the genuine dialogue and participatory practices reinforce each other, as presented in Table 1. Their interaction and benefits to P3 project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation are demonstrated below in the impact evaluation of the three cases. When participatory DME (especially with multiple stakeholders) is integrated from the outset of planning, partners have more capacity to address shared interests and demonstrate return on investment.

Table 1: Relational Tactics for Strategic Engagement: Dialogic and Participatory Communication Practices

Participatory Communication[i]	Genuine Dialogue[ii]							
	Mutuality	Presence	Commitment	Authenticity	Trust	Respect	Collaboration	Risk
Listening Openly		▼				▼		
Giving Voice	▼							
Relating as Partners	▼					▼	▼	
Forming Multiple Information Channels				▼			▼	
Jointly Strategizing, Implementing, Evaluating							▼	
Increasing Horizontal Dialogue			▼		▼			
Prioritizing Process	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Designing Messages Together		▼			▼			
Raising Consciousness			▼	▼				
Activating Informal/Formal Networks							▼	
Contextualizing Policy Problems	▼	▼		▼				
Fostering Inclusiveness, Continuity, Diversity						▼		
Encouraging Ownership			▼	▼		▼		▼
Deliberating to Understand and Motivate	▼						▼	▼
Experimenting to Transform and Sustain	▼			▼				▼

▼ Indicates where a participatory communication practice reinforces a practice in genuine dialogue. Learn more about how they work together at civilstrategies.net/about/.

i The 15 participatory communication practices listed in Table 1 are drawn from: Zaharna, 2010; Waisbord, 2014; Pamment, 2016; Gumucio Dagron, 2001; Kathryn S. Quick and Martha S. Feldman, "Distinguishing participation and inclusion," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31, no. 3 (2011): 272-290; and Silvio Waisbord, "Three challenges for communication and global social change," *Communication Theory* 25 (2015): 144–165.

ii The eight genuine dialogue practices in Table 1 are drawn from and directly attributable to Fitzpatrick, 2011, where they are fully developed.

Applying these dialogic, participatory practices facilitates measurement of change in P3s.[43] These practices help make sense of the blurred geographic, sectoral and technological boundaries of today's complex diplomacy and advance strategy, policy, engagement and relationship-building amid the magnified power of the non-state actor.

Aligning Context with Evaluation Methods

Assumptions and Structure

The following *post hoc* evaluation of three U.S.-based public and citizen diplomacy P3s features the contextual variables of complex, multi-stakeholder, and increasingly collaborative and cross-sector diplomacy. It measures the strategic engagement value of the IdEA, Chicago-Kyiv and Montgomery County-Morazán partnerships in material outputs, outcomes and impacts,[44] as well as relationship quality through the process variables of partnering, mediating and dialogic, participatory communication. The author generates a theory of change for each case.[45]

Case Selection[46]

The IdEA P3 emerged in 2011 as a U.S. Department of State U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) effort, building on USAID's Diaspora Networks Alliance.[47] The two other case studies were selected from the much larger subnational pool of more than 2,000[48] sister city projects. A Sister Cities International official suggested studying the Chicago-Kyiv twinning because of its high level of activity and collaboration, as well as its navigation of potential conflict.[49] The Chicago-Kyiv relationship was established in 1991, the year of Ukrainian independence from the former Soviet Union.[50] The selection of the second twinning, Montgomery County, Maryland with Morazán, El Salvador, was informed by Montgomery County officials advising that it was the locality's most active sister city project.[51] This match was

formalized in 2011.[52] All three projects share glocal interest in expanding trade, tourism and cultural ties and development with greater engagement and social inclusion of immigrant and diaspora communities.

Strengths and Limitations

This study is a step in further sharpening qualitative impact-evaluation methods to complement quantitative analysis and to contribute to the nascent field of P3 evaluation at the intersection of diplomacy and development. A *post hoc*, qualitative approach is essential for assessing the quality of partner and stakeholder relationships, but it is less generalizable than a quantitative approach.

Future evaluations would be improved by designing a mixed-methods impact evaluation at the outset of project design with a larger data set, research team and budget. Ideally, research design would include randomly assigned, inclusive treatment groups of lead and participant stakeholders and control groups of people not participating in a P3. Random selection of treatment and control groups is necessary to compare how much change can be attributed to P3 and how much could be because of unknown or unobserved counterfactual variables. Comparing the results of partnering or not involves quantitatively analyzing outputs, outcomes and impacts and qualitatively gauging the intensity level of dialogic and participatory communication practices, as well as attitudinal change. Likert response scales could be used in an interview or survey questionnaire.

In the present non-experimental design, the author did not conduct interviews outside the United States; moreover, the author did not gather any data on exchange activity initiated abroad. Although transnational media provided some evidence of IdEA's and the sister cities' outcomes and

impacts overseas, she relied mostly on U.S.-based interviews, program websites and media coverage.

Evaluation Findings

Strategic engagement is framed as the diplomatist's relational communication with strategic publics—here, diasporas—to pursue mutually agreeable, specific interests and activities. Its effectiveness is evaluated in the IdEA, Chicago-Kyiv and Montgomery County-Morazán P3s by the process variables of 1) partnering to promote shared interests and to attain them and 2) mediating among stakeholders with dialogic, participatory communication (see Table 1). The interests motivating each partnership are reflected in their pillars, goals and foci. They are displayed with partnership outputs, outcomes and impacts in this section's tables. Discussion of immediate to lasting results focuses on the eight genuine dialogue and 15 participatory communication tactics that support this strategic engagement.[53] The evaluation of each case concludes with a summarized theory of change.

IdEA

Promoting Shared Interests

Through a U.S. Department of State assistance award, Calvert Impact Capital (formerly known as Calvert Foundation) was IdEA's managing partner. The primary partners included the Secretary of State's Office of Global Partnerships (S/GP), USAID's Global Development Lab, and several nonprofits and private organizations.[54]

With the United States home to more than 60 million first- and second-generation immigrants,[55] IdEA's worldwide scope gives it the highest potential of the three cases for diaspora engagement. Additionally, with the global presence

of U.S. embassies, civil society institutions and corporations, IdEA has had to interact with the largest number of stakeholders. The Diaspora Map of IdEA membership shows more than 500 organizations, 322 of which operate from the United States, with the remaining balance in most other world regions.[56]

During and after Calvert Impact Capital's management of IdEA, interest in diaspora engagement has grown among U.S. embassies overseas, where more development and diplomacy programming emerges than at headquarters. At the implementation level, Calvert Impact Capital interviewees reflected that when it comes to partner needs and interests, the "challenge is framing it right." They practiced mutuality (see Table 1) in dialogue with other IdEA partners, demonstrating that they recognized the stakeholders' interdependencies and worked to value equally each other's interests and right to self-expression.

The mutual dialogue of IdEA partners and stakeholders has been reinforced by the participatory communication practices of giving voice to stakeholders, deepening partner relationships, focusing on capacity-building processes and resources over time, contextualizing policy scenarios with relevant diasporan perspectives—e.g., engaging U.S.-based Mexican-American and Central American entrepreneurs in the Latin America Impact Investment Forum—deliberating to understand and motivate, and experimenting with various projects to transform behavior.[57] In this instance, after IdEA's 2014-2015 partnership with the Forum to include diasporans, Forum organizers included diasporans in 2016 without IdEA sponsorship. Mentoring sessions on investment and panel discussion on diaspora facilitation during migration and refugee crises were two ways of coupling glocal diplomatic and development interests.

Table 2 shows the four IdEA pillars: heritage country investment and entrepreneurship, philanthropy, volunteerism and innovation, along with four goals identified in this evaluation. Flowing from genuine dialogue mediated by IdEA partners, all the outputs and outcomes in the table are demand-driven projects, many of which grew out of member survey responses.

Mediating through Dialogic, Participatory Communication

IdEA and the two sister city partnerships show signs of cross-culturally sensitive mediating between stakeholders and policymakers, a key function of modern diplomacy institutions.[58] IdEA's global platform requires mediating a "sense of individual and shared responsibility, identity, relationality, accountability, and capacity to manage conflict"[59,60] across multiple nationalities and cultures.

1. Administering New and Expanded Relationships

S/GP interviewees underscored IdEA's desired goal to facilitate diasporans' skills to increase cross-cultural understanding and opportunities for sustainable development through partnering. One official commented:

> The partners and partnerships take a little longer to develop but in the process, we are able to build a level of trust. We "win together." We want to have lasting partnerships that can be sustained past the original mission of a given project. To do that, we try to identify people and organizations that have greater capacity than us.

After identifying members' and partner agencies' needs and interests, Calvert Impact Capital established 37 new partnerships (see Table 2, outputs column) with those already running suitable programs to increase IdEA's multiplier effect. Whether these partnerships have continued should be subject to future evaluation.

2. Negotiation, Representation and Mediatization

Within and beyond the State Department, the IdEA network has strengthened confidence in diasporan capacity as citizen ambassadors. Calvert Impact Capital used an events strategy to focus on IdEA members' needs, while supporting U.S. interests. Conferences, forums, trainings and other outputs in Table 2 were part of this strategy. Supported by partners, Calvert Impact Capital managers deliberated with key stakeholders the reasons and logistics for each face-to-face or virtual convening or knowledge-sharing.

One example of the participatory practice to create multi-information channels for formal and informal communication is the 2014 Global Diaspora Media Forum, which assembled diaspora leaders, broadcast and online journalists, university faculty and students, and diplomats.[61] Other strategic engagements have involved web chats and webinars with U.S. ambassadors, subject-matter experts and town halls, bringing diasporan individuals and groups together with diplomats, civil society organization leaders and businesspeople.

3. Conflict Mediation

It might be reasonable to assume that inclusion of diasporas and other culturally diverse actors in P3s would deepen the potential for conflict, given cross-sector partnerships' inherently complex mix of mutual and dissimilar interests.[62,63,64] Such a claim would be invalid here, lacking a control group of non-diasporans.[65,66] Only a few minor inter-stakeholder group conflicts were mentioned in interviews or other sources.

The interviews with IdEA lead stakeholders, operating in a global programmatic landscape, reflect a pragmatic approach: situational awareness of potential for conflict and of navigating it with a focus on matching compatible partners and building trust.[67,68,69,70] As for the Kyiv and Morazán

sister city committee volunteers, the author was informed that when resource limitations, a project, event or external politics create tension, the committee, their government partners and other lead stakeholders work through them together.

According to interviewees, IdEA's global scope, multiple partners and more than 1,500 diaspora group members in the United States have required cooperative problem-solving to maintain meaningful relationships and achieve positive development and diplomacy results. An S/GP official noted that in the process of increasing investment and entrepreneurship, philanthropy and volunteerism in the IdEA network, conflicts do arise, but the IdEA partners and members try to stay focused on desired impacts. The author was also advised that Calvert Impact Capital IdEA managers left overall formal diplomatic relations to S/GP and other State Department offices.

The S/GP's role in IdEA before, during and after Calvert Impact Capital's management has been to encourage and embrace partners' and diaspora groups' ideas and motivations and fulfill its responsibility to be a credible, honest broker for the partnership and its members. Sincerity, transparency and timely information-sharing are the hallmarks of authentic dialogue, which IdEA has reinforced with attention both to processes that raise awareness of differing perspectives on policy problems and to encouraging ownership of project responsibilities (Table 1). S/GP has strived to demonstrate across the Department, USAID and other agencies that diaspora organizations generally put mutual concerns of their heritage countries and the United States ahead of those not commonly shared.[71]

The State Department, USAID and Calvert Impact Capital partners' balancing of encouragement and advocacy with political neutrality shape a constructive approach to conflict mediation. As two interviewees observed, no one diaspora

organization's interests equal the interests of the home or host country. The IdEA partners have created a "space for dialogue" and are always listening for ways to provide for members' reasonable requests. Generally, members have been eager to learn from each other, collaborate and lead by example, following the partners' inclusiveness rather than taking a divisive stance.

4. City-to-City Cooperation

S/GP and Calvert Impact Capital promoted synergy among digitally connected diasporas, sister cities, and citizen and subnational diplomacy. IdEA activated formal and informal networks among its members interested in pursuing links of their own. For example, Global Diaspora Week 2015 (Table 2) included a Google Hangout panel organized by Sister Cities International, featuring several lead stakeholders of twinnings and showing how they have used various grant programs and cross-sector relationships to expand mutual education, commercial and other benefits.

5. Integrating Project DME

Calvert Impact Capital's assistance award for managing the IdEA partnership required formative and summative evaluation, providing structure and data for reporting program results internally and publicly. Formative evaluation promoted relationship-building and joint strategizing, in this case with foreign and domestic stakeholders and partners.[72,73] Calvert Impact Capital sent participants a feedback survey or request for comments, sometimes before a training, workshop or other event—and always after. Survey results informed future program design and selection and were shared with presenters and government partners. Two summative efforts at the conclusion of Calvert Impact Capital's management were an infographic on its accomplishments posted on the website[74] and a summary impact report."[75]

Table 2. From Pillars to Impacts: International diaspora Engagement Alliance (IdEA)*			
Pillars and Goals	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Pillars: Investment & Entrepreneurship Philanthropy Volunteerism Innovation	More than 200 conferences, forums and events, including 160 during Global Diaspora Week in 2014 and 2015.	Capacity-building across sectors.	Increased diaspora engagement in investment & entrepreneurship, philanthropy, volunteerism and sustainable development in heritage countries.
Expand diaspora engagement in development and diplomacy.	Networking virtually and in person to connect and collaborate.	Promotion of corporate social responsibility among private-sector partners.	Strengthened diaspora community-building and capacity to build bridges across generations, cultures, ethnicities and nationalities.
Build skills and reputation of diaspora organizations as agents of cross-cultural understanding and socioeconomic development.	37 partnerships to design and conduct capacity-building training webinars on organizational strategy, fundraising, management of social media and volunteers, and other topics.	Empowerment of diasporas through training, networking, access to public speaking opportunities.	Larger role for nonprofit and private sectors and P3s for integrating diplomacy and development.
Generate new partnerships and networks.	Training in leadership (4), multicultural competency, organizing, public relations, marketing for social good.	Knowledge-sharing and codifying through the IdEA web platform.	More effective diaspora organizations.

Table 2. From Pillars to Impacts: International diaspora Engagement Alliance (IdEA)*			
Pillars and Goals	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Capacity development within diaspora organizations and across social and economic sectors	Research on member interests/ training needs/ satisfaction with IdEA programs, investment tools and remittances.	New and expanded channels for public diplomacy advocacy and equitable, sustainable development.	
	Diaspora Map tool, including 500+ organizations and 110+ countries.	Enhanced diaspora and diaspora organization trust-building, inside and outside government.	
	200 blog posts by members, staff and guests.		
	Informal and formal listening sessions and ad hoc coaching.		
	33 entrepreneurs, 22 mentors and 98 projects via MicroMentor program.		
	Fish 2.0 competition.		
*Sources: http://www.diasporaalliance.org/idea infographic-2014-2016/, interviews, IdEA Impact Report (August, 2016).			

The four officially stated IdEA pillars, along with the four goals, generated the material outputs and higher-level outcomes and impacts in Table 2. The outputs are the products of the events strategy, member survey and other formative and summative research, online communication, and partnering with established programs. Similar to the outputs and foci of the sister city cases, an IdEA output may trace to more than one pillar or goal. The last output

listed in Table 2—the 2015 Fish 2.0 Pacific Islands Hotspot Program—exemplifies the genuine dialogue practice of collaboration (Table 1). Fish 2.0 is a sustainable seafood business competition and field-building initiative to connect fishing, aquaculture and mariculture entrepreneurs with potential investors.[76]

State Department personnel and local NGOs organized media coverage around two pre-competition workshops specially designed by Fish 2.0 with Calvert Impact Capital's input based on past IdEA competition feedback surveys to improve future training.[77,78] The pre-competition workshops also exemplify collaboration because they generated non-competitive relationships from which new, jointly determined outcomes emerge. They utilized the participatory communication practices of horizontal dialogue and deliberation to understand and motivate through training to compete, not just to win, building community and encouraging leadership development in the process.

IdEA's well-integrated DME effort has facilitated this evaluation and proposed theory of change. Lack of a comparison (control) group and pre-program measurement prevents certainty about the extent to which the IdEA partnership is responsible for the four impacts in Table 2—or the outcomes leading to them. However, there are clear signs of progress on the IdEA pillars of investment, entrepreneurship, philanthropy, volunteerism and innovation and the goals of diaspora-engagement expansion, skill-building and partner-networking in sustainable development and diplomacy. Calvert Impact Capital's management of IdEA attracted 887 new members and a 300 percent increase in e-mail and social media followers and convened more than 10,000 participant stakeholders interested in diaspora engagement in development.[79] The communication, relationships and collaboration resulting in these outputs yielded outcomes for lead and participant stakeholders individually, in their

diaspora organizations and for their heritage countries. IdEA has had a broad impact, fostering cross-cultural awareness and new businesses and nonprofits. A Calvert Impact Capital manager described the impact as the "seeding of a broader entrepreneurial ecosystem and diaspora community-building."

Considering the benefits of IdEA, S/GP interviewees observed the difficulty of measuring the monetary value to taxpayers and other stakeholders. They noted that IdEA has conducted numerous projects in many regions, that every diaspora and heritage country is different, and that the projects are wide-ranging. Further, each partner has its own agenda; most efforts happen in the field both overseas and domestically; and, while there have been evaluations of public diplomacy P3s not involving diasporas, IdEA is the first oriented around them.

IdEA contributes to a culture of research and evaluation in diplomatic engagement and is a resource for future quantitative study whose results can be tested for longevity in years to come. To inform such a future evaluation, the author summarizes a theory of change—comprising the assumptions, planned and implemented outputs, outcomes and impacts of IdEA—as follows: using an events strategy to offer networking and tailored training opportunities along with mentoring and small grant programs, IdEA increases diaspora integration into diplomacy and development and promotes investment, entrepreneurship, philanthropy and volunteerism in heritage countries.

Chicago-Kyiv

Promoting Shared Interests

As a partnership dating back to 1991, the Chicago-Kyiv relationship shows a long pattern of addressing national priorities while pursing the two local governments'

interests.[80] One indicator of the twinning's importance to trade and national security is a number of grants from Open World (the exchanges arm of the U.S. Congress) and the State Department to carry out professional, diplomatic and other exchanges.

In Chicago, two staff members of the mayor's office liaise with the Kyiv Committee of 29 volunteers. The committee initiates most activities and supplies most of the effort for fundraising and project implementation. A key partner of the committee is Chicago Sister Cities International (CSCI).[81] CSCI allocates to the Kyiv Committee a portion of a grant shared among all 28 sister cities. Other direct partners of the committee and CSCI are the Chicago consular corps, banks and other businesses. Several committee members live and work in Kyiv, facilitating interaction with the mayor's staff there to coordinate Ukraine-based activities. Grounding the committee's projects is the genuine dialogue practice of commitment (Table 1) to proactive engagement toward mutually agreeable goals and outcomes reinforced through horizontal and group-directed dialogue, consciousness-raising (rather than top-down persuading) activities and shared project ownership.

Mediating through Dialogic, Participatory Communication

1. Administering New and Expanded Relationships

This P3 has led to long-lasting institutional and personal ties. The 135 exchanges and events in 14 categories (including four new partnerships), plus 26 fundraisers displayed in Table 3, reflect the committee's strong institutional networks. The exchanges and events have been sustained in more than a quarter century of visits by the Chicago- and Kyiv-based committees, which have also presented many opportunities to initiate and continue individual-level relationships. One lead stakeholder on the Kyiv Committee noted that traveling

to Ukraine regularly has afforded the experience of serving as an informal counselor to students, teachers, health care workers, and people wounded in the current war and ill from radiation exposure of the 1986 Chornobyl disaster. The open listening and sincere dialogue occasioned in these individual relationships suggested to this committee member a "positive model of change."

2. Negotiation, Representation and Mediatization

Through the Kyiv Committee's relationship-building, a lead committee member has "learned diplomacy, if anything," in the classic sense of appealing to the cultural identities and interests—which can involve political sensitivities—of a wide variety of interlocutors and ensuring projects have collective benefit. This citizen diplomat brokers across many sectors, groups and individuals, another example of the participatory communication practice of opening multiple information channels. The engagement efforts of Chicago-Kyiv are difficult to measure because participant numbers at the dozens of events and exchanges have not, to the author's knowledge, been systematically analyzed. However, this interviewee indicated that attendance at the committee's cultural, sports and fundraising events has regularly reached the hundreds or sometimes thousands; for example, a 2006 exhibit of early 20th-century Ukrainian modern art presented in Chicago and New York by the committee and other partners attracted more than 40,000 attendees and local media coverage.[82] Sponsoring partners of the U.S. tour included several Ukrainian and U.S. museums, private collectors, and more than a dozen companies and cultural and educational institutions.[83] The committee's Facebook page has more than 1,100 "likes,"[84] including from Kyiv.

3. Conflict Mediation

Ongoing Chicago-Kyiv citizen exchanges spanning the end of the Soviet era, Ukrainian independence, and annexation of the Crimea region by—and the continuing war

with—Russia signify the cohesiveness of the committee and its partners. Chicago's sister city partnerships with Moscow, Russia and Vilnius, Lithuania sometimes heighten political sensitivities.

An interviewee explained that the Ukrainian-Russian conflict and differing political constituencies in Chicago's Ukrainian-American communities have occasionally compelled the Kyiv Committee to pause recruitment efforts or to adjust participation in events. Those rare instances of exclusion suggest an opening for conflict mediation and policy learning[85,86] and a lapse of genuine dialogue and participatory communication but have not hindered the committee's overall cross-cultural efforts.

The committee has weathered a few disputes among Chicago's Ukrainian communities over "extreme" nationalism and pro-Russian separatism. One such incident, an interviewee recounted, occurred during a visit several years ago by a controversial mayor of Kyiv. The interviewee observed that "the beauty of sister cities is the space to work around conflict" and noted that a deeper clash between Ukraine and the United States could disrupt the P3.

Another interviewee noted that by staying out of debates captured in the media over Russia's 2013 invasion of Crimea and being a "voracious" consumer of a wide variety of reliable news sources, she could "walk a fine line" through politics at both city and international levels. Two interviewees acknowledged that in 2015, to the consternation of the Vilnius and Kyiv committees, CSCI selected the Moscow sister city chair to make videoed remarks at the annual consular gala, despite the absence of a Russian consul general in Chicago. They noted that this did not mar the cooperative relationship among the three committees.

The Kyiv Committee enjoys a high degree of credibility and a healthy mediating capacity that stands to continue contributing to the durability of the partnership, if not to citizen bridge-building, despite political conflicts. Members have gained a broader perspective on the world, and the Kyiv partnership has made a difference in perceptions of Ukraine among Chicagoans within and outside the diaspora. As an interviewee remarked, in the current era of polarity in U.S. society, the project nurtures young people by fostering diversity and unity, including successfully recruiting additional young adult committee members.

4. City-to-City Cooperation

Lead stakeholder-interviewees agreed that the committee is a "go-to" cultural and trade information resource for CSCI. The nonprofit works closely with the mayor's office and aldermen and alderwomen of the city's 50 wards, particularly in the areas with ethnic communities. These interactions among the Kyiv Committee, CSCI, and city administrators and elected officials are strategic because they foster communication to sharpen desired impacts and supportive programming. One leader said that the Kyiv mayor's office is also supportive and a steady point of contact. Official delegations have visited Chicago often, engaging in wide-ranging municipal issues from environmental management to public finance.

Variety among activities and their relevance to improved quality of life in both cities motivate lead and participant stakeholders. The P3 is part of the city's welcoming community efforts to new immigrants and holds events and fundraisers for humanitarian relief. Having trust-building dialogues (Table 1) and designing and publicizing innovative activities can nurture relationships that transform individuals and support, if not transform, institutions and communities. From joint research on breast cancer, to classical music

concerts, fashion shows and wrestling exhibitions, these activities reflect empathy for victims and survivors of Chornobyl and the current conflict with Russia.

5. Integrating Project DME

The extensive transnational activities among students, tourists, professionals, firms and institutions of the two cities are determined jointly by the committee, CSCI and staff of the Mayor of Kyiv. CSCI has a strategic plan for all of the sister city committees to enhance Chicago's soft power globally, and they follow its general guidance. Consistent with presence in genuine dialogue and several reinforcing participatory communication practices, the committee members are open to listening, consulting, designing projects and publicity together, and deliberating any problems (Table 1). Usually, the committee meets as necessary to plan, implement, monitor and assess their work. Assessment is internal and informal, except for the U.S. Congress Open World's pre- and post-project questionnaires.

The "History of Exchange" by CSCI,[87] interviews and online research indicate that the Chicago-Kyiv P3 strives to make a difference in Ukraine and the greater Chicago area. One lead stakeholder-interviewee described how the partnership spans the medical, cultural, educational, agricultural and trade fields, in addition to supporting immigration and naturalization efforts. He reflected that this broad agenda poses for the committee a complicated question about how to most effectively direct their engagement with, and help to, Ukrainians. Table 3 summarizes their foci, output activities, and desired or achieved outcomes and impacts.

Table 3: Achievements and Aspirations of the Chicago-Kyiv Sister City Committee*			
Foci	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Medical services	Exchanges and events: 1-Signing of the SC agreement 42-Culture	Better trained medical professionals and improved health care facilities.	Raise quality of mental and physical health care delivery.
Trade/tourism		Save lives and heal society.	Continue the 26-year pattern of long-lasting individual relationships, projects, welcoming community, and promotion of trade and tourism.
Culture	33-Education 20-Government 14-Health/ medical and social services	Expand opportunities for Ukrainian youth; open minds to change.	
Education	8-Economic development/ business	Enhanced cross-cultural understanding.	
Agriculture	4-Media 2-Sports 2-Humanitarian 2-Celebration	Foster improved public service delivery, from education to anticorruption.	
Immigration and naturalization	1-Environment 1-Diplomatic 1-Mayoral visit/	Strengthen commercial ties across agricultural and manufacturing sectors.	
Humanitarian response	street-naming 4-New Partnerships Total = 135	Increase international goodwill and sportsmanship.	
	26+ Fundraisers	Improve current infrastructure and prevent future environmental hazards.	Increase cross-cultural awareness and competency.
	$100,000+ value of in-kind donations		Foster governmental and private sector transparency and reform.
*Sources: "History of Exchange" (http://chicagosistercities.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Kyiv-2013.pdf) an unpublished update, interviews, and desk research.			

Chicago-Kyiv is primarily a volunteer activity whose lead stakeholders have little time to consider the long-term, broad impact of their efforts. Yet, the History of Exchanges and interviews make it possible to conduct a *post hoc* impact evaluation. One lead noted that ongoing collaboration in health care has visiting cardiologists communicating about cases and sharing new medical techniques. These impacts, he asserted, are "invaluable," implying longevity and potential for sustained transformation.

Regarding the P3's impact on governmental and private-sector transparency and reform, dialogue among lead and participant stakeholders in the partnership has led to unexpected insights into reducing corruption and interpreting nuanced discussion about civic and political issues. As situationally aware and influential strategic publics, these stakeholders include exchange visitors, the Kyiv Committee, current and former government officials, and members of partnering or participant civil society organizations. Although anti-corruption falls within the broad category of mutual interests for the two cities, it has not been an explicitly desired impact. During their U.S. visits, Kyivan exchangees observed Chicagoans' demands for governmental transparency and improved service delivery. They noticed how corporate social responsibility can reinforce citizen action. Also, during these visits, Chicago participants benefited from comparing their own civic experience with those of their Ukrainian counterparts.

Deliberations among sister city participants and government officials augment potential for understanding divergent political perspectives and mediating them for the collective good. Considering several occasions when official U.S.-Ukrainian diplomacy took place at charity events, an interviewee wondered whether the new cross-sector, cross-cultural connections would have been possible without a sister city relationship. Perhaps this interviewee was implying

the need for a control group in a future evaluation of this program's impact. In the present study, despite only having a loosely bounded treatment group, a proposed theory of change for further consideration is the following: with limited financial support for exchanges, the experienced volunteers in the Chicago-Kyiv partnership foster lasting relationships and collaborative projects across the health care, manufacturing, arts, tourism and government sectors that benefit individuals and tourism, trade, diplomacy and service delivery in both cities.

Montgomery County-Morazán

Promoting shared interests

The Montgomery County-Morazán partnership addresses the shared subnational goals of increased educational, health, trade and cultural opportunities. However, interviewee perspectives differed on the extent to which national interests are implicated, as well as whether the program is a public-private partnership. The lead organizer of the Morazán Committee asserted that it is more of a public-community partnership.

Similar to the Chicago-Kyiv partnership, the Montgomery County-Morazán sister cities emerged from the contextual variables of labor migration and civil strife, as well as shared cultural and trade interests. The 2009 "public forum to solicit ideas for prospective Sister Cities"[88] was a dialogue respecting ethnic communities' uniqueness and diversity (Table 1). It exemplifies deliberative engagement among strategic domestic publics across the entire majority-minority county.[89] Residents most strongly favored a partnership with Morazán, reflecting that Salvadoran immigrants and descendants comprise the largest ethnic minority in the county. This twinning is the first of five to be sponsored by

the nonprofit Montgomery Sister Cities and the Montgomery County Office of Community Partnerships (OCP).[90]

As confirmed by a lead stakeholder, since its official start in 2011, the partnership has targeted educational and career opportunities for youth and growth in the education and health sectors. Through cultural, educational, technical and business activities, Salvadoran and Salvadoran-American youth have opportunities to advance their skills and to inform a healthy sense of identity or familiarization with both cultures.[91] This partnership also reinforces the goals of the welcoming community executed by the OCP.[92]

The primary partner of the Morazán Committee is their counterpart committee in Morazán. The lead Maryland stakeholders are members of the committee and the Montgomery Sister Cities board, representatives of the Association for Educational Development in El Salvador and leaders of several other organizations.[93]

Although this linkage lacks an official history of exchange, activities have been publicized by Montgomery Sister Cities, the committee, media outlets and blogs. The annual reports on this twinning, minutes of committee meetings, the partnership's Facebook wall[94] and partners' websites are additional secondary information sources. The author compiled a chronology of activities[95] to prepare Table 4.

Interviewees stated that the Morazán Committee largely planned and implemented output activities on its own and through informal working relationships, with facilitation by OCP staff and other volunteers as needed. Basic planning and meeting expenses are funded from a county grant covering all sister city partnerships.[96] Other major resources are in-kind and cash donations from nonprofits, individuals, local businesses and fundraisers. The annual fiesta is the main effort for college scholarships.

Table 4: Achievements and Aspirations of the Montgomery County-Morazán Sister City Committee*			
Foci	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Youth	Exchanges and events: 1-Exploratory Trip 1-Signing of the SC agreement 23-Culture 14-Socioeconomic justice & development 2-Education 1-Government 1-Economic development/ business 1-Sports 2-Celebration 4-New Partnerships Total=50	Strengthen educational and career opportunities for youth through scholarships and instructional assistance.	Higher quality education and healthcare.
Education		Update medical and educational equipment and facilities.	Improved local governance and civil society/ private sector engagement.
Culture		Enhance cross-cultural understanding.	Migration by choice rather than necessity.
Health		Strengthen business ties.	
Economic development			
Local governance			
Social support for recent immigrants	$12,000+-Fund-raising		
Science/ technology**	$30,000+-In-kind donations		
*Sources are interviewees, online research, and media reports. Several interviewees who have been lead stakeholders in the partnership reviewed the table. **An interviewee advised that the exchanges have not yet included science or technology.			

Mediating through Dialogic, Participatory Communication

1. Administering New and Expanded Relationships

An OCP official sees the Morazán-Montgomery partnership as the most effective way to engage with the county's Salvadoran residents. Relationships pursued in this twinning have generated 50 outputs across ten categories, emphasizing education, health and social justice projects, along with promoting Salvadoran culture. They have spawned four partnerships with businesses and nonprofits, engaging more participant stakeholders in additional events and projects.[97]

2. Negotiation, Representation and Mediatization

In this case, dialogue and participation are driven by the lead citizen volunteers, concentrating on benefits at the community level. Some English-language documentation of participation in El Salvador is available to provide estimates of lead and participant stakeholders in Morazán-based activities.[98] Combined with other information sources, these accounts illustrate the dialogue leading to relationships and strategic engagement in networks to contextualize and potentially influence policy.[99] A county delegation's 2010 exploratory trip to Morazán included a dozen Salvadoran governmental and nonprofit partner staff.[100] An interview disclosed that the Salvadoran-American board member of Montgomery Sister Cities voluntarily represented the county and negotiated arrangements for the trip with the governor's office and ADEL/Morazán, an association for local economic development.

Working with Habitat for Humanity/San Salvador, they went on to assist with some of the earliest exchanges, mobilizing numerous volunteers. The circle of participant stakeholders grew through cultural events and beneficiaries of Habitat services and training. Over time, as with Chicago-

Kyiv, staff and the Morazán Committee leaders have encouraged recruitment of more young adult members for the committee; the current co-chairs are women under the age of 30. The committee sees a continuing need to engage county residents of diverse backgrounds and perspectives.

The Morazán Committee relies on socializing and motivating the two communities around shared purposes[101] to deepen understanding of Salvadoran culture and develop closer connections among Salvadoran diplomats and Montgomery County residents and officials. They do this through social, cultural and professional events open to the public and held at venues across the county, from schools, to the civic center, to restaurants. County liaisons have been helpful with promoting the mutual benefits of the partnership in local media, including the annual fiestas and an exhibition soccer game.[102]

3. Conflict Mediation

Although the partnership has experienced some growing pains and frustrations, little friction was revealed in interviews or other research. Because of the Morazán Committee's mediation and realistic planning, differences among older and newer members about allocating limited resources have been worked out with the understanding that all contributions make a difference.

4. City-to-City Cooperation

The extent of transnational cooperation between sister cities is a function of volunteer interest and capacity, funding, and support and pressure from local government. The Morazán-Montgomery sister cities agreement calls for economic and cultural ventures on multiple levels, and the active interest of the committee, in partnership with nonprofits, will continue to be the primary sources for cooperation. Similar to Chicago-Kyiv's relationships among

Chicago's Ukrainian community, Morazán's network helps connect Salvadoran-American businesses, nonprofits and government agencies in suburban Maryland. Perhaps as the relationship matures, and as Salvadoran-American civil society and businesses expand, entrepreneurship and grant opportunities can be pursued.

5. Integrating Project DME

The sister city committee plans projects that are responsive to community needs and interests and makes decisions based on the situation and resources at hand. According to an OCP staff interviewee, formal planning and evaluation processes are still "gelling." Monitoring and evaluation are informal "reality checks," conducted regularly and openly by committee members and other lead stakeholders in the two locales, following the goals of the agreement. The lead organizer of the committee welcomes future technical assistance in strategic planning, funding and cross-sector engagement.

Habitat for Humanity volunteers' new and rehabilitated homebuilding projects in the remote northern village of El Barrial are "perhaps the partnership's most significant output," according to an OCP official. Exchanges of people, donations of equipment and fundraisers contribute to better schools and more college graduates, employment opportunities, medical care and improved governance in the department of Morazán. College scholarship opportunities for Salvadoran-American students, and county residents' overall partnership activities offer ways to deepen connections in El Salvador and further enact a sense of responsibility and commitment to rising generations in Morazán.[103,104]

After a November 2015 delegation to Morazán, the Montgomery County Council president reaffirmed the vice president of El Salvador's message of hope that Salvadorans

abroad continue contributing to equitable development in the department through their remittances but that cash infusions must be accompanied by human resources and infrastructure. The council president stated that the sister city partnership was another way to stem the losses of emigration, break down racial barriers and build lasting social and economic ties.[105] The committee's output activities—made possible through fundraising and in-kind donations valued at $30,000—are material steps toward these goals. Just as important is the relationship-building generated by genuine dialogue and diverse participation during these events. One lead stakeholder, not of Salvadoran descent, said that after a conversation with her spouse about the risk (Table 1) of traveling with their youngster to Morazán, mother and daughter had smooth and fulfilling exchange visits, enhancing cross-cultural affinities.

Through early 2017, the impacts of the sister cities partnership on Morazán and Montgomery County have varied across the areas of higher-quality education and health care, improved local governance and citizen/private-sector engagement, and migration. As one of the most productive projects, the Habitat for Humanity's new and rehabilitated home construction in northeastern Morazán has raised living standards for dozens of families and strengthened local civic leadership and environmental management skills.[106]

The other significant impact of the partnership has been in educational and career opportunities for youth, providing benefits to individual students and several schools and colleges and instilling confidence in all partners to make a difference in their communities. In a full impact evaluation, it would be possible to measure the benefits from scholarships, school enrichment programs and exchanges, and equipment donations.

To improve local governance and civil-society/private-sector engagement, a lead stakeholder noted that the committee hopes to demonstrate through exchanges how citizen participation can expand the private sector. Supporting youth opportunity, social services for new immigrants, cross-cultural competency and other welcoming community processes have all been part of a county effort that, according to a former county-council president, has been associated with reduced gang violence, stronger trust in government and enhanced global competitiveness.[107]

Migration by choice, rather than necessity, is an aspirational impact of the partnership that was voiced by a lead stakeholder-interviewee. Enhancing diversity, cross-cultural understanding, social integration, education and quality of life for the people of Morazán and Montgomery County complement the benefits of remittances and official development assistance that reduce "brain drain" because of emigration.

Synthesizing the initial and potential impacts of this partnership suggests the following theory of change: largely through voluntary community-based organizations, the Montgomery County-Morazán sister cities increase citizen engagement, events and exchanges dignifying Salvadoran culture, educational opportunity, health care delivery, public/private-sector accountability and living standards.

Conclusion: The Present and the Possible for Strategic Public-Private Partnership

At the intersection of U.S. diplomacy's national, local and citizen dimensions, engagement with diverse, non-state diaspora actors increases the strategic value of public-private partnering. The number of federal and municipal government-initiated P3s, including diaspora organizations, is small in comparison to all exchange programs. However,

many of the 2,121 U.S. sister city partnerships have diasporan connections, anecdotally suggesting wide P3 engagement with diaspora organizations at the local level.[108]

Identity politics, relationship-building and collaboration among growing populations of diasporans and other global publics call for government-civil society mediation. The U.S. Department of State-USAID International diaspora Engagement Alliance and the Chicago-Kyiv and Montgomery County-Morazán sister cities evaluated in this study mediate collective public interests and occasional conflicts,[109] credible policy-making and soft power.[110,111,112,113,114] With many voices, lead stakeholders engage through genuine dialogue[115] and participatory communication[116,117,118] to establish and pursue mutual international, national and community-level interests. Their participatory dialogue practices aid in demonstrating qualitatively the P3s' strategic engagement value.

Lead stakeholders in IdEA mediate with formal, participatory design, monitoring and evaluation processes. The sister cities conduct DME less formally. IdEA's outputs have encouraged investment, entrepreneurship, philanthropy and volunteerism in heritage countries. As for the sister cities, the number and variety of activity and event outputs and higher-level cultural, economic and governmental reform-related outcomes and impacts are commendable, especially given their generally small budgets and largely volunteer-based administration. We can measure the long-run sustainability of each partnership's engagement strategies, relational tactics and socioeconomic benefits with ongoing monitoring and evaluation.

These partnerships demonstrate how participatory communication and DME foster cost-effective, inclusive networking and relationship-building in public and citizen diplomacy and intergenerational, cross-cultural and socially responsible transnational-to-community-level mediating

institutions. For example, the participatory communication practice of listening openly to absorb multiple perspectives in problem definition, goal-setting, reporting and codifying DME processes reinforces the dialogic act of presence. In this relational act, diplomatists are in close proximity and open to engaging with diverse stakeholders affected by a current or contemplated program before its implementation.[119] Building relationships with citizen diplomats extends practitioners' presence across sectors and communities.

Continued study and mediating of dialogic and participatory communication practices in strategic engagement and its DME inform the ongoing work to advance a culture of intergovernmental research and evaluation in public and citizen diplomacy. This work enables state and non-state actors to determine collaboratively whether P3 is an appropriate process-tool in a given political context. It also supports rigorous P3 development in increasingly complex diplomatic and good governance initiatives across societal sectors. Political will is needed to invest in affordable program measurement and to attract and motivate volunteers, including program alumni, to participate. Partnering with local postsecondary institutions, foundations, and associations for volunteer and low-cost evaluators is another important source of capacity-building.

Most importantly, strategic, relational communication begets responsive policy. Systematic, participatory DME contributes credible evidence for program advocacy and modification in the virtuous circle of public-private partnering and international diplomacy. So armed, the many hands of P3 proponents are empowered to shape responsive policy and programs with diplomatists and legislators.

Endnotes

1.   The author is indebted to the interviewees, Rhonda Zaharna and Robert Banks, for their review.

2.   Pisarska, Katarzyna. "US Government-sponsored Educational Exchange Programs." *The Domestic Dimension of Public Diplomacy: Evaluating Success through Civil Engagement*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 145-186.

3.   22 USC Ch. 33: Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Program, Title 22—Foreign Relations and Intercourse.

4.   A more detailed version of this review, further explaining the contextual and process variables and communication practices, is available at http://www.civilstrategies.net/about/.

5.   Trent, Deborah L. "Cultural Diplomacy Partnerships: Cracking the Credibility Nut with Inclusive Participation." *Nontraditional U.S. Public Diplomacy: Past, Present, and Future*, edited by Deborah L. Trent, Public Diplomacy Council, 2016a, p. 195 (emphasis added) of pp. 191-218. The relationship-building frame in official diplomacy is developed by Bruce Gregory, "Public Diplomacy: Sunrise of an Academic Field," *Public Diplomacy in a Changing World*, special issue of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, edited by Geoffrey Cowan and Nicholas Cull, vol. 616, 2008, pp. 274-290; and cited on p. 8 of Bruce Gregory, "Mapping Boundaries in Diplomacy's Public Dimension," *Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 11, 2016, pp. 1-25.

6.   Gregory ("Mapping Boundaries in Diplomacy's Public Dimension") employs process variables to distinguish between diplomacy, governance, civil society and private-sector firms, while showing how they interact across "trans-governmental and polylateral networks" (p. 1). Creative, technological and social processes occur amid dynamic cultural and economic contexts variables, according to a study of science diplomacy P3s by Elias G. Carayannis and Charalampos Babis Papadopoulos, "The Innovation Diplomacy Concept and the Hellenic-American Innovation Bridge as a Special Case-in-point," Journal of the Knowledge Economy, vol. 2, no. 3, 2011, pp. 257-326.

7. Ibid, 257.

8. Lee, Su-Mi. "Mediator Impartiality and Mediator Interest." Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 2013, pp. 9-10, uknowledge.uky.edu/polysci_etds/8.

9. Odaira, Takeshi. "Contextual Determinants of International Third-Party Mediation: Cases of Internal Armed Conflicts in the Asia-Pacific Region." GIARI Working Paper, vol. 2009-E-9, Waseda University Global COE Program, 2010, p. 3, www.files.ethz.ch/isn/139241/2010.02.15.2009-E-9O2009-E-9.pdf.

10. Gregory, "Mapping Boundaries in Diplomacy's Public Dimension," p. 8, citing *Diplomacy in a Globalizing World: Theories and Practices*, edited by Pauline Kerr and Geoffrey Wiseman, Oxford University, 2013.

11. Trent, Deborah L. "American Diaspora Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Policy and Lebanese Americans." Discussion Paper in Diplomacy, no. 125, Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', 2012a, p. 7, www.clingendael.nl/sites/default/files/20121206_discussionpaperindiplomacy_125_trent_beveiligd.pdf, citing Gabriel Sheffer, "A New Field of Study: Modern Diasporas in International Politics," *Modern Diasporas in International Politics*, edited by Gabriel Sheffer, Croom Helm, 1986, p. 3.

12. Werbner, Pnina. "The Place Which Is Diaspora: Citizenship, Religion, and Gender in the Making of Chaordic Transnationalism." *Homelands and Diasporas: Holy Lands and Other Places*, edited by A. Levy and A. Weingold, Stanford University, 2005, p. 42.

13. Bijlana Scott, "Skills of the Public Diplomat: Language, Narrative and Allegiance." *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy*, edited by Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas, Martinus Publishers, 2010, pp. 231-250.

14. Huijgh, Ellen. "Public Diplomacy in Flux: Introducing the Domestic Dimension." *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2012, pp. 359-367.

15. Huijgh, Ellen. "Public Diplomacy's Domestic Dimension in the European Union." *European Public Diplomacy*, edited

by M. K. D. Cross and J. Melissen, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, pp. 57-84.

16. Pisarska.

17. Fitzpatrick, Kathy R. "Public Diplomacy in the Public Interest." *Journal of Public Interest Communications*, vol. 1, 2017, pp. 78-92.

18. See, for example: http://sistercities.org/sites/default/files/SCI%20Young%20Professional%20Toolkit.pdf on projects emphasizing young professionals in the United States; https://medium.com/the-sister-cities-exchange/top-10-moments-from-sister-cities-internationals-60th-anniversary-celebration-982cd3dfacb7#.wsr1dttbg for testimony on the value of sister city relationships to undergird and complement public diplomacy.

19. Terrazas, Aaron. *Connected through Service: Diaspora Volunteers and Global Development*, Migration Policy Institute, 2010, p. 10.

20. Ibid, 8.

21. The meaning and practice of "strategic engagement" are much debated. My distillation emerges from several sources: 1) "A Framework for the Strategic Planning & Evaluation of Public Diplomacy," NATO Joint Analysis and Lessons Learned Centre, June 2013, p. 6, Box 2; 2) Bruce Gregory, "American Public Diplomacy: Enduring Characteristics, Elusive Transformation," *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 6, no. 3-4, 2011, p. 352; 3) Silvio Waisbord, "The Strategic Politics of Participatory Communication," *The Handbook of Development Communication and Social Change*, edited by K. G. Wilkins, T. Tufte and R. Obregon, John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2014, p. 148; 4) R.S. Zaharna, "Mapping Out a Spectrum of Public Diplomacy Initiatives: Information and Relational Communication Frameworks," *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, edited by N. Snow and P. M. Taylor, Routledge, 2008, p. 3; and 5) Craig Hayden, "'Engagement' Is More Convenient Than Helpful: Dissecting a Public Diplomacy Term," *CPD Blog*, USC Center on Public Diplomacy, 20 Jun. 2013, uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/%E2%80%9Cengagement%E2%80%9D-more-convenient-helpful-dissecting-public-diplomacy-term.

22. Carayannis and Papadopoulos.

23. Fitzpatrick, K. R. "Defining Strategic Publics in a Networked World: Public Diplomacy's Challenge at Home and Abroad." *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2012, pp. 421-440.

24. Fitzpatrick, Kathy. "U.S. Public Diplomacy's Neglected Domestic Mandate." *CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy*, USC Center on Public Diplomacy, paper 3, Figueroa Press, 2010.

25. Tweh, Bowdyea. "White House Taps Ghafari to Launch Lebanon Aid Partnership." *Crain's Detroit Business*, 25 September 2006/15 March 2017, www.crainsdetroit.com/article/20060925/SUB/60925004/white-house-taps-ghafari-to-launch-lebanon-aid-partnership.

26. Trent, Deborah L. "App or No App, Public Diplomacy Is Still All About Relationships." *CPD Blog*, USC Center on Public Diplomacy, 12 Feb. 2016, uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/app-or-no-app-public-diplomacy-still-all-about-relationships.

27. Jamali, D. "Cross-sector Social Partnerships (CSSPs): Prospects and Challenges for Social Change in the Middle East." Presented at a meeting on cross-sector collaboration organized by the Research Center for Leadership in Action at NYU Wagner, 24-26 Oct. 2011, Abu Dhabi, accessed 18 July 2012 at wagner.nyu.edu/files/cross_sector_social_partnerships_jamali.pdf, as cited on p. 84 of Deborah L. Trent, "Transnational, Trans-Sectarian Engagement: A Revised Approach to U.S. Public Diplomacy toward Lebanon," Doctoral thesis, 2012b, pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/1038836409.html?FMT=AI.

28. Ibid.

29. A more recent example of the U.S. government promoting soft power of diaspora-sourced information technology is: https://share.america.gov/immigrants-find-success-silicon-valley/.

30. Fitzpatrick, "Public Diplomacy in the Public Interest," p. 88, quoting R.S. Zaharna, "The Cultural Awakening in Public Diplomacy," *CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy*, USC

Center on Public Diplomacy, paper 4, Figueroa Press, 2012, p. 26.

31.   Lee, p. 9.

32.   Odaira, p. 3.

33.   Carayannis and Papadopoulos, p. 27.

34.   Gregory, "Mapping Boundaries in Diplomacy's Public Dimension."

35.   Fisher, Ali and Scott Lucas. "Introduction." *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy*, edited by Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas, Martinus Publishers, 2010, pp. 1-15.

36.   Copeland, Daryl. "The Seven Paradoxes of Public Diplomacy." *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy*, edited by Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas, Martinus Publishers, 2010, p. 189.

37.   Rannveig Mendoza, Dovelyn and Kathleen Newland. *Developing a Road Map for Engaging Diasporas in Development: A Handbook for Policymakers and Practitioners in Home and Host Countries*, International Organization for Migration & Migration Policy Institute, 2012.

38.   Orr, K. and M. Bennett. "Relational Leadership, Storytelling, and Narratives: Practices of Local Government Chief Executives." *Public Administration Review*, 2016, p. 8.

39.   Trent, "American Diaspora Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Policy and Lebanese Americans."

40.   James Pamment distinguishes "mediation" in the general, institutional sense intended in the present study, from "mediated communication," a.k.a. "mediatization," whereby "communication technologies have become so integrated into everyday activities that our knowledge and experience of the world is significantly altered..." in "The Mediatization of Diplomacy," *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 9, 2014, p. 258.

41.   Fitzpatrick, Kathy R. "U.S. Public Diplomacy in a Post-9/11 World: From Messaging to Mutuality." *CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy*, USC Center on Public Diplomacy, paper 6, Figueroa Press, 2011, pp. 25, 36.

42. Zaharna, R.S. "The Public Diplomacy Challenges of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement." *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy*, edited by Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas, Martinus Publishers, 2010, pp. 201-230.

43. Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, "Introduction," Making Waves: Stories of Participatory Communication for Social Change, New York, The Rockefeller Foundation, 2001, accessed 9 January 2018 at https://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/Gumucio-2001-Making.pdf

44. Outputs are defined as "[p]roducts and services delivered" and can be counted; an outcome is "a *specific result* a program is intended to achieve" as a result of outputs ("Performance Measurement Definitions." Evaluation Division, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State, pp. 1-2, eca.state.gov/files/bureau/performance_measurement_definitions.pdf). Impact is what "an organization hopes to achieve in support of a goal...reached by achieving a series of desired outcomes" ("A Framework for the Strategic Planning & Evaluation of Public Diplomacy," p. 7, Box 2).

45. Theory of change is framed as "[t]he assumed causal pathway specifying the changes in knowledge, attitudes and behaviours that the individuals in a target audience need to exhibit for goals to be achieved" (Ibid, "A Framework for the Strategic Planning & Evaluation of Public Diplomacy," p. 7, Box 2).

46. The author of this study conducted 13 personal interviews with government and implementing nonprofit agency staff, along with lead and participant volunteer stakeholders of the three partnerships. Interviewees validated transcripts and findings. Additionally, the author observed, or participated in, partnership-sponsored meetings, conferences and other gatherings. Literature review included examination of each case's social media postings and media outlets' coverage of their activities.

47. The USAID DNA and IdEA comprise the initial federal-level effort to engage diasporan organizations as strategic publics (https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1880/DNA_Framework_(revAug2013).pdf; https://www.state.gov/s/partnerships/diaspora/). The rationale of the

agencies for pursuing diasporan partners in diplomacy and development is that they are already "informal ambassadors for the United States in their countries of origin" ("International diaspora Engagement Alliance." *U.S. Department of State*, www.state.gov/s/partnerships/diaspora/).

48.   See http://sistercities.org/what-we-do/.

49.   Email exchange with Adam Kaplan, Vice President of Sister Cities International, June 2017.

50.   The 2017 population estimate for Kyiv is 1,734,471 (https://www.citypopulation.de/php/ukraine-admin.php?adm2id) and Ukrainian Americans in the Chicago region number around 45,000 compared to the city population of approximately 2,695,598 (http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1279.html;https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml).

51.   As the author is based in Maryland, the Montgomery County setting also facilitated in-person interviewing and participant observation.

52.   Morazán's population is 203,753, and Montgomery County's Salvadoran-American population is approximately 69,809 of 1,026,371 residents (*2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*, accessed 12 January 2018 at factfinder. census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview. xhtml?pid=ACS_16_5YR_B03001&prodType=table), with the majority of immigrants claiming Salvadoran heritage (*Montgomery Sister Cities Report to the Community 2009-2014*, p. 4, montgomerysistercities.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/MCSC-Report_web72dpi.pdf).

53.   Further information about output activities and higher-level outcomes is available at http://www.civilstrategies.net/about/.

54.   IdEA's other primary partners from October 2013 to August 2016 were the Diaspora African Women's Network, Semai Consulting and Fish 2.0. In September 2016, S/GP resumed IdEA management, with USAID's Global Partnerships Division continuing as a federal agency partner.

55.   See http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/select-diaspora-populations-united-states.

56.   See http://www.diasporaalliance.org/the-diaspora-map/.

57.   "IdEA Impact Report." Made available by the Office of Global Partnerships, Aug. 2016, pp. 34-36.

58.   Hocking, Brian. "Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Forms, Functions, and Frustrations." *Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Challenges and Opportunities*, edited by Jovan Kurbalija and Valentin Katrandjiev, DiploFoundation, 2006, p. 21.

59.   Fort, Timothy L. "Corporation as Mediating Institution: An Efficacious Synthesis of Stakeholder Theory and Corporate Constituency Statutes." *Notre Dame Law Review*, vol. 73, no. 1, 1997, p. 175.

60.   Zaharna, R.S. "Diversity in Publics and Diplomacy." Working Paper, Project "Diplomacy in the 21st Century," no. 15, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP)/German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2017.

61.   See posts by Sandra Romero and Deborah Trent at http://www.diasporaalliance.org/global-diaspora-media-forum/.

62.   Trent "American Diaspora Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Policy and Lebanese Americans."

63.   Trent, "Transnational, Trans-Sectarian Engagement: A Revised Approach to U.S. Public Diplomacy Toward Lebanon."

64.   Zaharna, "The Public Diplomacy Challenges of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement."

65.   "A Framework for the Strategic Planning & Evaluation of Public Diplomacy."

66.   White, Howard. "Impact Evaluation: An Overview and Some Issues for Discussion." 30-31 Mar. 2006, www.cgdev.org/doc/eval%20gap/HowardWhiteDAC.pdf.

67.   "A Framework for the Strategic Planning & Evaluation of Public Diplomacy."

68.   Fisher and Lucas (eds.), 2010.

69.   Fitzpatrick, "Defining Strategic Publics in a Networked World: Public Diplomacy's Challenge at Home and Abroad."

70.   Zaharna, "The Public Diplomacy Challenges of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement."

71. An example of promptly and inclusively mediating mutual concerns occurred when S/GP was convening a July 13, 2016 multi-stakeholder roundtable to brainstorm and network on the Zika crisis. Organizers agreed with this author's suggestion to invite diasporans from affected locales.

72. Zaharna, "Mapping Out a Spectrum of Public Diplomacy Initiatives: Information and Relational Communication Frameworks."

73. Huijgh, "Public Diplomacy's Domestic Dimension in the European Union."

74. See http://www.diasporaalliance.org/idea-infographic-2014-2016/.

75. "IdEA Impact Report."

76. A copy of "Fish 2.0 Pacific Islands Hotspot Program: Outcomes and Participant Feedback" was supplied by Calvert Impact Capital.

77. Interviews.

78. "IdEA Impact Report," pp. 23-26.

79. Ibid, 43.

80. Sister Cities International has received partial support from the Department of State. Find earlier examples of sister cities pursuing national and subnational interests in: Laura A. Mitchell, "An Assessment of the Sister Cities International Program as an International Public Relations Entity." Master's thesis, Rowan University, 1997; Wilbur Zelinksky, "The Twinning of the World: Sister Cities in Geographic and Historical Perspective," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 81, no. 1, 1991, pp. 1-31; David Horton Smith, "Voluntary Inter-cultural Exchange and Understanding Groups: The Roots of Success in U.S. Sister City Programs," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, vol. 31, 1990, pp. 177-192.

81. CSCI is a division of World Business Chicago, a nonprofit arm of the city government (http://www.chicagosistercities.com/who-we-are/) that receives an annual sum of approximately $528,643 for salaries and administration of all twinnings.

82. "History of Exchange: Kyiv, Ukraine: Chicago's Sister City Since 1991." Chicago Sister Cities International, 2013, chicagosistercities.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Kyiv-2013.pdf.

83. See http://www.wumag.kiev.ua/index2.php?param=pgs20064/124.

84. See https://www.facebook.com/KyivCommittee/.

85. Zaharna, "The Public Diplomacy Challenges of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement."

86. Hudson, Lucian. *The Enabling State: Collaborating for Success*, United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 2009.

87. A 2016 update of the "History of Exchange" was provided by an interviewee.

88. *Montgomery Sister Cities Report to the Community 2009-2014*, http://montgomerysistercities.org/documents/MCSc-Report_Jan_2015.pdf: 4.

89. "Deliberative engagement" is sketched in Trent, "American Diaspora Diplomacy: U.S Foreign Policy and Lebanese Americans, pp. 14-15.

90. *Montgomery Sister Cities Report*, 4.

91. Strategic engagement that fosters constructive national identity resonates with the collaborative public diplomacy of Hudson, *The Enabling State*, and Ali Fisher, "Looking at the Man in the Mirror, Understanding of Power and Influence in Public Diplomacy," *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy*, edited by Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas, Martinus Publishers, 2010, pp. 271–295.

92. The "Montgomery County, Maryland Welcoming Community Framework" for administering services to recent immigrants is coordinated by the Office of Community Partnerships (see https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/partnerships/Resources/Files/OCP_Welcoming_Framework.pdf).

93. Other lead stakeholders of the Morazán Committee include the county OCP liaisons, members of the Comunidades Transnacionales Salvadorenos Americanos (COTSA, the metropolitan D.C.-based network of Salvadoran hometown

associations), organizers of Habitat for Humanity Metro Maryland (Sebastian Montes, "Montgomery Builds its Salvadoran State of Mind," *Patch*, 6 Sept. 2012), Montgomery College and MoverMoms. Frequent participant stakeholders and contributors include Hungry for Music, Healthy Montgomery and several hospitals.

94.   See https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=sister%20cities%2Fciudades%20hermanas%20montgomery-morazan.

95.   The Morazán Committee chronology is at http://www.civilstrategies.net/about/.

96.   The county government allocates $25,000 annually to administer sister cities programs.

97.   The Washington Area Wheelchair Society, MoverMoms and Hungry for Music are former partners. (Luz Lazo, "Montgomery Sister City Agreement Strengthens Ties to Salvadoran City," *The Washington Post*, 14 Oct. 2011; Montgomery Sister Cities newsletter, iss. 1, Dec. 2014, montgomerysistercities.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/MCSC_NL_Winter201415_web.pdf).

98.   A partial list of El Salvador-based activities is available at http://montgomerysistercities.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/MCSC_NL_Winter201415_web.pdf.

99.   Fitzpatrick, "Defining Strategic Publics in a Networked World."

100. Silvestre, Karla. "Sister Cities Exploratory Trip to Morazán, El Salvador, Connecting Montgomery County with the World, August 7-14, 2010." www.montgomerycountymd.gov/partnerships/resources/files/sistercitiesexploratorytriptomorazan.doc.

101. Fort.

102. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gdXxF12SF8U and Charles Boehm and Quinn Casteel, "Maryland Men Fall 3-1 to U-23 El Salvador Team Vying for Olympic Berth," *Soccerwire*, 11 Mar. 2012.

103. Werbner.

104. Denhardt, Janet V. and Robert B. Denhardt. *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*, expanded ed., M.E. Sharpe, 2007.

105. See http://www.mymcmedia.org/council-president-george-leventhal-returns-from-el-salvador-video/.

106. "Building Community with El Barrial Project (2013-2016): Final Project Report." Habitat for Humanity, June 2017.

107. Ibid.

108. Kaplan-Trent, e-mail, June 2017.

109. Zaharna, "Diversity in Publics and Diplomacy."

110. Hocking, "Multistakeholder Diplomacy."

111. Hocking, Brian, Jan Melissen, Shaun Riordan and Paul Sharp. "Future for Diplomacy: Integrative Diplomacy in the 21st Century." Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael,' no. 1, 2012.

112. Comor, E. and H. Bean. "America's 'Engagement' Delusion: Critiquing a Public Diplomacy Consensus." *The International Communication Gazette*, vol. 74, no. 3, 2012, pp. 203-220.

113. Fitzpatrick, "Public Diplomacy in the Public Interest."

114. Brown, K. A., S. N. Green and J. Wang. *Public Diplomacy and National Security in 2017: Building Alliances, Fighting Extremism, and Dispelling Disinformation*, Center for Strategic & International Studies, 2017.

115. Fitzpatrick, "U.S. Public Diplomacy in a Post-9/11 World."

116. Zaharna, "Mapping Out a Spectrum of Public Diplomacy Initiatives."

117. Waisbord, "The Strategic Politics of Participatory Communication."

118. Waisbord, Silvio. "Three Challenges for Communication and Global Social Change." *Communication Theory*, vol. 25, 2015, pp. 144–165.

119. Fitzpatrick, "U.S. Public Diplomacy in a Post-9/11 World."

Author Biography

Deborah L. (Debbie) Trent is an independent consultant and analyst in public diplomacy and international development. Clients include the Global Humanities Institute at Montgomery College, Maryland and other academic institutions and educational organizations. Current research focuses on designing, monitoring and evaluating public-private partnerships and other programs that support cross-cultural understanding and international enterprises.

Contributing two chapters, Debbie was managing editor of *Nontraditional U.S. Public Diplomacy: Past, Present, and Future*, the most recent publication of the Public Diplomacy Council in the United States. She is secretary of the council's board. Debbie has taught public diplomacy at the graduate level and managed college and university partnerships and Fulbright programs at the former U.S. Information Agency for 13 years, after a Presidential Management Internship.

While completing a Ph.D. in public policy and public administration, Debbie held fellowships at George Washington University and the Arab American Institute and coordinated human resource management research for a GW-Bearing Point partnership. Prior, she co-founded a nonprofit international education and training firm, serving community colleges as well as universities.

Active in local-to-global civil society, Debbie chairs the American Society for Public Administration Section on Effective and Sound Administration in the Middle East and the Montgomery County, Maryland Middle Eastern American Advisory Group.

Debbie's CPD Research Fellowship Project is titled, "Gauging the Quality of Public-Private Partnership Programs Involving U.S.-Based Diasporas."

Other Papers in the CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy Series

All papers in the CPD Perspectives series are available for free on the Center's website (**www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org**). To purchase any of the publications below in hard copy, please contact: cpd@usc.edu.

2018/3 Seventy Years of the Smith-Mundt Act and U.S. International Broadcasting: Back to the Future?
by Barry A. Sanders

2018/2 Organizing Public Diplomacy: A Layered System
by Barry A. Sanders

2018/1 From Crawling to Walking:
Progress is Evaluating the Effectiveness of Public Diplomacy: Lessons Learned from NATO
by Barbora Maronkova

2017/3 The Floating Tree: Crafting Resilient State Narratives in Post-Truth Environments
by Vivan S. Walker

2017/2 Sino-Vatican Faith Diplomacy:
Mapping the Factors Affecting Bilateral Relations
by Juyan Zhang

2017/1 Why the Voice of America Remains a Vital Force in the World
by Geoffrey Cowan

2016/5 The Reem Island Ghost: Framing State Narratives on Terror
by Vivian Walker

2016/4 The Public Diplomacy of Emerging Powers Part 2:
The Case of Indonesia
by Ellen Huijgh

2016/3 Canadian Public Diplomacy and Nation-Building:
Expo 67 and the World Festival of Arts and Entertainment
by Kailey Hansson

2016/2 Intersections between Public Diplomacy & International
        Development: Case Studies in Converging Fields
        by James Pamment

2016/1 The Public Diplomacy of Emerging Powers, Part 1:
        The Case of Turkey
        by Ellen Huijgh and Jordan Warlick

2015/7 Public Diplomacy in Global Health:An Annotated
        Bibliography
        by Tara Ornstein

2015/6 Democratization through Public Diplomacy: An Analysis
        of the European Parliament's Reaction to the Arab Spring
        by Michael Reinprecht & Henrietta Levin

2015/5 Centers of Gravity in Public Diplomacy:
        A Case Study of U.S. Efforts in South Africa
        by Amelia Arsenault

2015/4 Public Diplomacy of Multilateral Organizations:
        The Cases of NATO, EU, and ASEAN
        by Zhikica Zach Pagovski

2015/3 Benghazi: Managing the Message
        by Vivian Walker

2015/2 Soft Power and Public Diplomacy: The Case of the
        European Union in Brazil
        by María Luisa Azpíroz

2015/1 Distinguishing Cultural Relations from Cultural
        Diplomacy: The British Council's Relationship with Her
        Majesty's Government
        by Tim Rivera

2014/3 Confucious Institutes and the Globalization of China's
        Soft Power with contributions
        by R.S. Zaharna, Jennifer Hubbert, and Falk Hartig

2014/2 De-Americanizing Soft Power Discourse?
        by Daya Thussu

CPD | USC Center on Public Diplomacy
at the Annenberg School