

**TOWARDS A THEORY OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY**  
**A quantitative study of public diplomacy and soft power**

By

Ivan Willis Rasmussen  
PhD Candidate  
The Fletcher School (Tufts University)  
[ivan.rasmussen@tufts.edu](mailto:ivan.rasmussen@tufts.edu)

10 March 2014

**\*\*NOT FOR REDISTRIBUTION WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR\*\***

## ABSTRACT

The following study seeks to develop an explanatory theory concerning public diplomacy. While there are various theories that offer explanations for state actions in international relations, there has yet to be a fully formed, independent theory for the practice of public diplomacy or soft power activities. The limited theoretical basis for understanding public diplomacy is matched by a need for augmented methodological approaches. The following study offers several hypotheses explaining the conduct of public diplomacy as theoretical lines or avenues for subsequent analysis. The study also expands the field of public diplomacy with a novel quantitative element of statistical analysis of the practice of soft power or image maintenance worldwide. This quantitative element is used to test the various explanations of motivations as to why states practice public diplomacy including rational, idealistic, and social trend motivations. The study suggests that rational explanations for the practice of public diplomacy, represented by key factors in the quantitative study such as wealth and prestige, constitute the main motivational force. However, a social trend or non-rational movement towards the practice of public diplomacy also has explanatory potential. The increasing number of states interested in and practicing public diplomacy indicates an emerging norm that goes beyond a rational, interest-based calculation. On the other hand, the study finds that idealistic motivations for conducting public diplomacy are limited despite the original concept of “credible diplomacy” as truth over propaganda. In the end, public diplomacy and soft power writ-large depend not only on rational calculations of the utility of promoting a state’s image abroad but also on the pattern of international affairs in a context of increasing public awareness.

**Key words:** public diplomacy theory, quantitative methods, soft power, public diplomacy practice, rational choice, constructivism

## **Introduction: The emergence of Public Diplomacy**

Thomas Friedman (2004) wrote about a potential Third World War as a “Western” battle against fundamentalism, a new “War of Ideas”. Similarly, the former United States undersecretary for public diplomacy, James Glassman (2008), described to the New America Foundation “Public Diplomacy 2.0” as “the war of ideas” where liberal openness is contrasted by radical repression. The scope of the potential next great conflict extends past this dichotomy. The New World War of Ideas exists as a phenomenon that goes beyond the characterization of the clash of Islam versus the ‘West’; it is a contest of ideas and narratives that is happening as multi-polarity prevails and states have become increasingly interested in soft power projection. The practice of public diplomacy is at the center of this emerging phenomenon. Soft power and the power of ideas have become the sticks and stones of the modern state. The concern shifts to whether different narratives can coexist on the global level. Soft power and public diplomacy need not lead to bellicose contestation; rather, mutual activities may open ground for increased comity based on dialogue. Despite the salience and richness of public diplomacy, the study of public diplomacy has not expanded beyond case analysis of powerful states and actors. There is a pressing need for novel studies concerning public diplomacy and soft power.

Public diplomacy is the next frontier in the practice and study of diplomacy. The “old” style of diplomacy has been supplanted with “new”, open American-style diplomacy (Nicolson, 1962). States have gone beyond practicing open diplomacy on the world stage to using public diplomacy to promote and secure their national interests abroad. Public diplomacy can be defined as the activities of a state’s government through its ministry of foreign affairs (MFA) to

influence a foreign public with the goal of promoting and projecting its interests.<sup>1</sup> Even the basic definition of public diplomacy as the active effort by a state's government to influence a foreign public must be complicated by the variety of actors that can be involved in the practice of public diplomacy including "global citizens", NGOs, businesses, and members of the media. Regardless of the contestable definition of public diplomacy, it is hard to deny the arrival of the new style of diplomacy.

The Edward Murrow Center at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (2009) offers a well-cited definition of public diplomacy that contrasts public diplomacy with "traditional diplomacy":

Public diplomacy ... deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one state with those of another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication, as between diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the processes of inter-cultural communications.

Central to this concept of public diplomacy is the communication between nations, peoples, and cultures. Public diplomacy is the task of many including journalists who would share the experiences of other states with their audiences. While the idealism of such a definition of public diplomacy is obvious, it also brings up the necessity of communication and interaction for the practice of public diplomacy.

Public diplomacy was a particularly salient government pursuit during the Cold War period when the contest of ideologies, communism versus democracy, was at a high. Within

---

<sup>1</sup> The first person credited with the term "public diplomacy" was Edmund Gullion, a former US diplomat who coined the term during the inauguration of the Fletcher School's Edward R. Murrow Center. <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/murrow/public-diplomacy.html>.

<sup>2</sup> The author does note that governments can sometimes "use" the multitude of actors such as the media in the pursuit of public diplomacy. In this way, the importance of these actors as channels for public diplomacy efforts by state governments is somewhat encapsulated by this study.

<sup>3</sup> Consider the tenure of Karen Hughes as the undersecretary for US public diplomacy.

public diplomacy, there were two camps centered on the great powers of the US and the Soviet Union. Contesting ideologies appeared to come down with the wall in 1989 and, later, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The bipolar nature of public diplomacy during the Cold War gave way to an “end of history” where the US democratic narrative became dominant (Fukuyama, 2006). The relevance of public diplomacy was lessened and the US mechanism for public diplomacy, the United States Information Agency (USIA), was dissolved as an independent entity as it was absorbed by the US Department of State.

The bipolar quality of public diplomacy during the Cold War period has been replaced with a multitude of states practicing public diplomacy as key interests in soft power have increased. Joseph Nye (2005) outlines the concept of soft power as international image, in particular, highlighting the values underlying a government’s interests. For example, US soft power is the ability to attract others by the legitimacy of its actions. The linkage with public diplomacy is between the theoretical international relations concept of different “forms” of power and the practical elements of how states expand or improve their soft power capacity. Public diplomacy studies can also elucidate the “how” of soft power, notably the means with which states project their interests through soft power.

While public diplomacy has emerged as a critical element in the international activities of many governments, not all states practice public diplomacy and the role of the diplomat as an interlocutor between governments has not diminished. The emergence of public diplomacy does not eliminate the importance of traditional diplomatic interactions. Much of modern diplomacy occurs with cameras and microphones on, but the closed-door element of diplomacy remains intact. The traditional role of the diplomat and the primacy on bilateral relations has not decreased in importance; rather, this role has been supplemented by the needs of public

diplomacy. Image and substance have become intertwined. The modern diplomat must be aware of this fact without losing the lasting focus on bilateral diplomat-to-diplomat relations.

At the heart of the practice of public diplomacy is the practice of “cultural diplomacy” or the spreading of a state’s culture abroad. In fact it can be said that: “Cultural diplomacy is the linchpin of public diplomacy; for it is in cultural activities that a nation’s idea of itself is best represented” (Advisory Council on Public Diplomacy, 2005). Cultural diplomacy can become the pursuit of governments practicing public diplomacy, “requiring a long-term commitment to winning the hearts and minds of reasonable people everywhere” (Advisory, 2005) through the promotion of a nation’s popular culture. There have been significant studies concerning cultural diplomacy as public diplomacy particularly on the American practice of cultural diplomacy; however, the theoretical linkages between cultural diplomacy and public diplomacy offer another relatively unexplored topic in the study of diplomacy.

From the discussion of the practice of public diplomacy based on cultural diplomacy, which could include anything from pop music to coca cola, it is obvious that the actors conducting public diplomacy extend beyond a state’s government. As mentioned at the onset of this discussion, public diplomacy can be understood as being a government or foreign ministry activity with the goal of influencing other governments through their public. But governments are certainly not the only actors involved in public diplomacy. As one commentator describes the current practice of diplomacy: “The traditional model of diplomacy, founded on the principles of national sovereignty and of statecraft, is becoming less relevant as a field of new, influential actors enter the international system. Diplomats must now engage a vastly larger number of players in host countries, as the age-old ‘club model’ of diplomacy gives way to a less hierarchical ‘network model’” (Heine, 2005). The complex network of actors involved in public

diplomacy arises out of the modern phenomenon of the proliferation of non-state actors. While the proliferation of non-state actors practicing public diplomacy holds infinite importance in any current study of diplomacy, this study holds that public diplomacy is a specific pursuit of governments.<sup>2</sup>

If public diplomacy includes a cultural dimension involving a multitude of actors but, for the sake of this study, often is conducted by governments, then it is logical to ask where public diplomacy takes place. Cultural diplomacy occurs on the battleground or, less bellicose, meeting place of cultures and peoples, likewise public diplomacy is the promotion and projection of a state's views that is facilitated through the use of the internet. In fact, government-initiated public diplomacy is much more active than allowing a state's "culture" to amorphously spread. This form of public diplomacy relies on the promotion of a state's interests directed toward a foreign public primarily through the medium of information technology. One commentator summarizes the "use" of the internet by governments conducting public diplomacy:

The Internet can be considered by governments as a unique diplomatic instrument; through its proper use they can 'advertise' not only their positions on different issues, but also promote their ideas worldwide. Such a function, if used in the right way, helps the embassy, and as a result the state that it represents, to create a positive image in the host state. This is what Joseph S. Nye, Jr. has called 'soft power'. So, the Internet is a political instrument of public diplomacy for a government to publicize its positions and to create a favorable image in the host state (Christodoulides, 2005)

Necessarily, a central element in this study is the use of the internet by governments for public diplomacy. The internet is the "where" of public diplomacy and has become the tool of governments practicing public diplomacy.

---

<sup>2</sup> The author does note that governments can sometimes "use" the multitude of actors such as the media in the pursuit of public diplomacy. In this way, the importance of these actors as channels for public diplomacy efforts by state governments is somewhat encapsulated by this study.

Despite the overwhelming importance of the internet to the practice of public diplomacy, there are several other relevant “places” where public diplomacy occurs ranging from other communications technology such as radio and newsprint to the activities of the diplomat in everyday conversation with foreign public opinion leaders. This study will examine several of these other “locations” of public diplomacy but will retain a focus on internet-based public diplomacy particularly in the quantitative analysis.

The central criticism to the proliferation and practice of public diplomacy is the concept of public diplomacy as propaganda. There are some analysts and practitioners that would consider state activities under the concept of strategic command or state branding as true public diplomacy. The limitations of public diplomacy as public relations are well documented.<sup>3</sup> Public diplomacy, in its early stages, was even been labeled as state propaganda. US public diplomacy efforts come under particular criticism: “The United States has been in the international propaganda business, off and on, for a long time . . . propaganda played a crucial role in the war of independence” (Dizard, 1961). An historical reference will elucidate the criticism of public diplomacy as propaganda. Winston Churchill (1948) describes, in *The Gathering Storm*, the actions of Adolph Hitler in the commencement of World War II: “Simultaneously, in order to baffle British and American public opinion, Hitler declared that the occupation was purely symbolic....This provided comfort for everyone on both sides of the Atlantic who wished to be humbugged.” Churchill goes on to describe Hitler’s interest in maintaining prestige and providing a cover for Germany’s aggression. Murrow’s boys may have swayed the American public towards the allied just cause in World War II, but the manipulation of the media by Hitler poses a serious criticism of public diplomacy ideals.

---

<sup>3</sup> Consider the tenure of Karen Hughes as the undersecretary for US public diplomacy.

Perhaps this criticism is best answered by the purported founding father of public diplomacy, Edward Murrow. Murrow (1963) writes: “Truth is the best propaganda and lies are the worst. To be persuasive we must be believable; to be believable we must be credible; to be credible we must be truthful. It is as simple as that.” Murrow explains the necessity of public diplomacy to maintain a high level of credibility based on truthful, persuasive reporting. Inherent in the activity of the diplomat is an appeal to foreign publics grounded in how legitimate they find the representative and his government to be. A final defense of public diplomacy lies in the view that it is a tool to be used by governments which does not have a moral requirement. In this way, public diplomacy is a tool of the diplomat and the government he represents, not embedded with any special ideals.

### **Explaining the practice of Public Diplomacy**

If public diplomacy and soft power constitute the metaphorical “next-frontier” in the practice of diplomacy, then they also are the next key branch of study in the fields of international relations and diplomatic studies. There has been significant literature discussing the practice of public diplomacy particularly that of American public diplomacy. On the other hand, the theoretical aspects of public diplomacy have not garnered as much attention. Existing research in public diplomacy suffers from several major weaknesses:

Most studies are historical, and they mostly deal with the U.S. experiences during the cold war. Historical accounts of public diplomacy are significant, especially if they are analytical and not just anecdotal, but their contribution to the development of theory and methodology in public diplomacy has been limited. Limited, too, is research on public diplomacy programs and activities of countries other than the United States and of new international actors such as NGOs, civil society groups, and individuals (Gilboa, 2008).

The nascent field of public diplomatic studies has yet to develop a specialized theory. For example, Cold War theories of public diplomacy based on the dichotomy of ideologies are

limited due to the end of the Cold War and the emergence of new narratives. On the other hand, public diplomacy as purely a government pursuit should be challenged the proliferation of actors involved in the construction of a state's international image from private businesses and individual citizens to NGOs and the media. These are all the underlying theoretical questions that new studies in public diplomacy must confront.

In terms of methodology, the study of public diplomacy has developed salient comparative case analysis but no specific method has been advocated (Henrikson, 2004). The underlying social facts that dictate the behavior of individuals and, necessarily, states require models that seek to describe underlying motivations (Durkheim, 1994). International relations offers several such models for determining behavior including the realist, liberal, and the constructivist perspectives. The study of public diplomacy has yet to systematically develop similar and independent models: "Models are needed to develop knowledge because they focus on the most significant variables and the relations between them. Occasionally, models of diplomacy and foreign policy include superficial references to public diplomacy, but very few scholars developed specific models of public diplomacy itself" (Gilboa, 2008). While this study does not presume to build a comprehensive method in studying public diplomacy, it does offer several theoretical avenues worth consideration. Each of the prominent theoretical approaches to understanding motivations for the practice of public diplomacy, rational choice, idealism, and social trend, will be tested by the quantitative model and then refined with discussion of practical aspects of public in the qualitative case study.

### **Rational choice model**

A rational choice perspective concerning public diplomacy would suggest that there is a continuum of costs and benefits that form the basis for the calculus of states that practice public

diplomacy. A rational theory then would find that states practice public diplomacy out of national interests, usually a complex measurement of immediate and future gains. These interests could range from prestige (a key indicator in the quantitative study) to tangible economic benefits perhaps including increased tourism or greater proclivity for outside states to trade with the state. The obvious advantages of public diplomacy and improving a state's international image contrast the more opaque interest of convincing other states to a state's national narrative. The possible rational motivations explaining the practice of public diplomacy found in this broad study include the desire to:

- 1) preserve international prestige (Example: the US)
- 2) combat negative international impressions (Example: Sri Lanka)
- 3) improve financial situation (Example: donors for Afghanistan and business for Singapore)
- 4) keep control over the information that flows into and out of the state (Example: China)

The rational, cost-benefit analysis that might predict the practice of public diplomacy also includes a relevant cost: capacity including wealth and development. In this way, a state practices public diplomacy out of national interests but the possibility of practicing public diplomacy may be limited by capacity. In evaluating the rational motivations behind the practice of public diplomacy it will be central to understand factors such as prestige and wealth.

While the rational explanation for motivations concerning public diplomacy holds great sway in this study, there is a central criticism to the rational perspective. The critique of rational choice public diplomacy motivations comes from the concept of "credible public diplomacy". Murrow argues that for public diplomacy to be effective it must be credible and, necessarily, truthful. If the motivations behind the practice of public diplomacy are purely rational, self-interest, then there is a distinct possibility that the perceived credibility of public diplomacy is diminished. States may decide it is in their interest to project their ideals and image abroad;

however, the practice would be undermined if the foreign public thought that the public diplomacy narrative being projected is contrived and a vehicle for manipulation. In this way, self-interest can run counter to the efficacy of public diplomacy.

Beyond the limitation of rational motivations as potentially limiting the efficacy of public diplomacy, there is also the persistent concern of rational choice involving an impossible or, at least, unidentifiable calculus. Even if they desire to act rationally, states may not appropriately distribute their resources or otherwise miscalculate the cost-benefit analysis. In this way, rational analysis of the motivations behind public diplomacy practice offers a base to theoretically explain public diplomacy but not definitive explanation.

### **Ideals and public diplomacy**

An ideal theory concerning the practice of public diplomacy is based on the concept of “credible public diplomacy”, outlined by Murrow. The open diplomacy inherent in public diplomacy, as described by Nicolson, hinges on the Wilsonian ideals of democracy and openness. Therefore, states practicing public diplomacy due to idealistic reasons would envision their activities as based upon and promoting an ideal of freedom. Necessarily, the quantitative study might, under an idealistic theory of motivations to conduct public diplomacy, show states with high levels of democracy and freedom of media/political systems practicing public diplomacy. The examination of this factor of freedom is particularly applicable under an idealistic motivation for states which consider public diplomacy worthwhile and uphold that the public being influenced will, in turn, influence its government. One commentator succinctly describes the links between idealism and public diplomacy: “Skillfully conducted and adequately resourced, this ‘new diplomacy’ — of which public diplomacy has become an integral part — will continue to contribute toward a safer and more peaceful world” (Roberst,

2006). Following these assumptions, the study will look to see if mostly democratic and free countries practice public diplomacy.

The ultimate critique of open diplomacy and idealistic public diplomacy comes from George Kennan. Kennan (1984) focuses on the rational power balances both pre and during the Cold War. He thinks back to the old, traditional diplomacy:

The Department of State as it existed at the turn of the century, and as it still was in large measure in the 1920's when I entered it, was a quaint old place, with its law-office atmosphere, its cool dark corridors, its swinging doors, its brass cuspidors, its black leather rocking chairs, and the grandfather's clock in the Secretary of State's office. There was a real old-fashioned dignity and simplicity about it. It was staffed in those earlier days by professional personnel some of whom were men of great experience and competence. And it was headed more often than otherwise by Americans of genuine stature and quality.

Kennan fears the “short-term trends of public opinion”, erratic and undependable public views, and emotionalism. Kennan is nostalgic for the atmosphere of the past based on “dignity and simplicity” but closed and aloof from the outside world. He further critiques the ideals of equality found in open diplomacy through the United Nations as unrealistic and not attentive to the ever-changing international scene.

Kennan’s critique finds further substance in the work of Oren Stephens. Stephens considered public diplomacy to be “propaganda” and non-ideal. In *Facts to a Candid World: America's Overseas Information Program*, Stephens described US information programs as propaganda (Stephens, 1955). Similarly the United States Information Agency, the first formal public diplomacy instrument of the US, firmly placed the US in the activity of “international propaganda business” (Dizard, 1961). Far from idealism, the base of public diplomacy is considered here to be self-interest and deception. In fact, the perspective of idealistic motivations for public diplomacy must meet a final challenge: It appears as though public diplomacy can be understood without a democratic ideal present in communist states such as

China and Russia. The quantitative study will test the possibility of idealistic motivations of public diplomacy based on concepts of democracy and freedom.

### **Non-rational, social trends towards public diplomacy**

Idealistic motivations for public diplomacy also point toward a more abstract concept of explanations of state actions based on non-rational, social trend theory. As with idealistic motivations which may lie outside a rational interest calculus, the concept of a social trend includes two levels of states practicing public diplomacy out of mimetic or imitative actions and due to social pressures towards the behavior. The non-rational, social perspective would suggest a trend towards public diplomacy where states conduct because they perceive it to be the appropriate behavior of states. States see other states practicing public diplomacy and follow suit. In this way, public diplomacy is not necessarily rationally based.

The concept of a social trend towards a certain state practice can be seen in the waves of democratization post World War II. Different norms emerge and states are socialized into these behaviors. For example, positive views of democracy can be seen as a general social trend amongst states, but rationalists contend that there is a rational calculus often beyond being part of the democratic trend such as the benefits of more state aid. In contrast, a non-rational social trend towards public diplomacy appears to lack these immediate benefits; states do not reward the states that try to influence their publics. In examining the possible non-rational, social trend motivations, it will be necessary to see a general trend towards the increased practice of public diplomacy and some outlier cases to the rational perspective. One would expect to find a general trend of increased public diplomacy without prevailing interest calculations. It will be difficult to find a social trend with a basis more in the spread of ideas and emergence of norms than in

tangible concepts such as wealth or freedom level. That having been said, the proliferation of states practicing public diplomacy lends credence to this concept.

The ultimate criticism of the social trend theory begins in the difficulty of observing this motivation matched with the rationalist view that states act with reason and even social behaviors have a rationalist origin. To survive as part of the international collective, it is important to observe some norms of action. For example, even perpetually “neutral” Switzerland finally joined the UN in 2002. Rationalists would say that it eventually became untenable for Switzerland to not be part of this order and that cost-benefit analysis includes the element of pervasive social pressures. In fact, it can be argued that social behavior has a rational origin in the motivation of a desire to be part of a group. Finally, the critics would contend that if public diplomacy has become a norm of state behavior, then this does not explain the many states which remain outside this sphere of activity. Despite these relevant criticisms, the trend towards the practice of public diplomacy cannot be ignored, whether rationalist, idealistic, or non-rational in origin, as an exponential number of state narratives now fill the international environment. These different hypothetical theories for understanding motivations of the practice of public diplomacy will be tested in the quantitative study, and they are put forward as potential avenues for further research into what motivate state actions at the international level.

### **Quantitative inferences**

In testing the variety of theories explaining the practice of public diplomacy, a quantitative approach is extremely useful. However, public diplomacy in this model must be understood as a concerted or conscious effort by a government to promote its interests to a foreign public with the goal of altering that public’s perception of the state and changing the diplomatic actions of that public’s government. With government-initiated public diplomacy as

the dependent variable, there are several characteristics of countries or factors that will can examined. These factors include: wealth as per capita GDP, level of development, size as population, level of “freedom”, stable democracy, international prestige, years practicing “open” diplomacy, the number of missions abroad, and technological capacity. The study will show whether and how each of these factors play a role in determining whether or not a state practices public diplomacy.<sup>4</sup>

### **The dependent variable: Government-initiated public diplomacy**

In the development of the quantitative model the countries selected play a critical role and the dependent variable of government-initiated public diplomacy sets the central pursuit of the study. As mentioned before, public diplomacy expands beyond the government level. Notable non-state actors practicing diplomacy include NGOs, businesses, international organizations, private citizens, and more. For example, one scholar finds that “Governments play a major role [in public diplomacy] but they do not act alone and the private sector is intimately involved in commercial diplomatic activities” (Mercier, 2008). That being said, this study focuses on public diplomacy associated with government agency. Public diplomacy is central to the current form of diplomacy being practiced by state governments. Governments use public diplomacy typically through the internet to project their interests on foreign publics. In the development of a quantitative model examining public diplomacy, the key preliminary step is to evaluate the set of countries to see which countries practice public diplomacy.

For each of the countries examined, the author explored whether or not their governments practice public diplomacy through their foreign ministries. A prime indicator as to whether or not

---

<sup>4</sup> The author must note the significant limitations of the model. Most information comes from English language or translation sources including information from US government sources such as the CIA world fact book. The current study only examines countries with MFA websites and nine major factors. Some data requires non-objective measures but to the best effort of the author and other sources with a priority on consistency.

a state is practicing public diplomacy is the structure of its ministry of foreign affairs (MFA). The initial research as to whether or not specific countries practice public diplomacy required each state's MFA and its structure to be examined. For example, if the MFA of a state has a significant department dedicated to public diplomacy or image promotion/projection then that state can be considered to be practicing government-initiated public diplomacy. There were several such cases where a state's MFA explicitly admits or recognizes that it conducts public diplomacy. One prominent example would be the US, which has an extensive department in its MFA dedicated to public diplomacy. The "Press and Public Diplomacy Department" of the Albanian MFA is another specific example. Other, less explicit, examples of state MFA departments conducting public diplomacy include departments responsible for public diplomacy efforts such as the "Department of Information and Public Affairs" (New Zealand), the "The Information Department" (China), the "Press/Information and Media/Relations Department" (Afghanistan), "Kulturpolitische Sektion" (Austria), and the "Ministry of Press and Culture" (Chile).<sup>5</sup> Beyond MFAs dedicated to public diplomacy, the study also finds that the mission statement of each MFA may indicate a preference towards public diplomacy. A final indicator is the variety of studies that may describe the public diplomacy activities of states that do not have explicit MFA or mission statement evidence of the practice of public diplomacy.<sup>6</sup>

### **Single-factor regression results**

In examining the single-factor regressions the study will add a quantifiable evaluation to complement and develop the earlier basic comparisons between the dependent variable of public

---

<sup>5</sup> In the instance of the Chinese Information Department, the role of public diplomacy includes a wide range of functions both domestically and abroad in being: "in charge of releasing news and stating China's position concerning the international issues, China's foreign policy and foreign relations; to handle the affairs related to resident and visiting foreign journalists; and to coordinate the domestic press in reports concerning foreign countries or nationals." (Chinese MFA website)

<sup>6</sup> See the author's website for more details on criteria for the practice of public diplomacy:  
<http://quantpd.wikispaces.com/Table+of+Factors>.

diplomacy and each factor. The key to understanding the regression findings is to envision the comparison of public diplomacy and a factor as a scatter plot graph with the dependent variable of public diplomacy on the y-axis and the factor on the x-axis. The regression analysis will find a best fit line to organize the various points on the graph into a linear function ( $Y=A+BX$  where  $Y$  is public diplomacy;  $A$  is the y-intercept—where  $x=0, y=a$ ;  $B$  is the slope determined by the regression; and  $X$  is the specific factor being examined). For the study, each factor's linear function is listed below, then  $y$  is set to equal 1 (the practice of public diplomacy) and the resulting  $x$ , rounded to the nearest whole number and a half, shows the likely codec of the factor for states that practice public diplomacy. The findings concerning each linear regression will be discussed below:

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Linear Regression</b>	<b>When <math>Y=1</math></b>
Wealth	$Y=.08+.09x$	$X=9$
Development	$Y=-.035+.105x$	$X=10$
Size	$Y=.016+.14x$	$X=7$
Freedom	$Y=-.08+.2x$	$X=5$
Democracy	$Y=.23+.29x$	$X=3$
Prestige	$Y=-.12+.26x$	$X=4$
Years of OD	$Y=.11+.1x$	$X=9$
Missions abroad	$Y=.59+.0824x$	$X=5$
Tech capacity	$Y=.02+.13x$	$X=7$

- When comparing wealth with public diplomacy, the information from the linear regression supports the conclusion that public diplomacy is predominately practiced by wealthy countries. The optimal wealth level or codec for countries that practice public diplomacy ( $y=1$ ) is 9, which covers the range of 20,001 USD plus.
- The linear regression comparing development and public diplomacy shows that states with a development codec of 10 practice public diplomacy; however, this is a codec well beyond the range of states studied (maximum codec of 6).
- The linear regression for size and public diplomacy leaves much to be desired in terms of conclusive evidence that mostly large (population size) countries practice public diplomacy. When  $y=1$  and a state practices public diplomacy, the optimal size of that state is at the codec level of 7, a size that was not even considered in the range—the original maximum codec being 6, a level of 300 million—would equate to over 1 billion. It appears as though there is a significant problem in the linear regression concerning size; this indicates the general

pattern that bigger countries are more likely to practice public diplomacy is incorrect.

- The freedom and public diplomacy linear regression finds that countries that practice public diplomacy ( $y=1$ ) do not necessarily need to be free. The freedom codec level for countries conducting public diplomacy is 5, which goes beyond the maximum codec of 3.
- The linear regression for democracy does not provide conclusive evidence that only stable democracies practice public diplomacy. The function comparing democracy and public diplomacy creates a codec of 3, a figure higher than the maximum codec of 1 for stable democracies. Even though this quantified relationship suggests that stable democracies would practice public diplomacy there is concern with such a high codec.
- Prestige and public diplomacy have a linear regression that shows high correlation. The optimal level of prestige for countries practicing public diplomacy with a codec of 4 or a permanent member of the UN Security Council. This confirms the general observation that the more prestigious a state, the greater the propensity for that state to conduct public diplomacy.
- The linear regression for years of open diplomacy offers definitive pattern or conclusion as the codec for years of open diplomacy when a state practices public diplomacy is 9, well outside the range of years as a member of the UN.
- When the number of missions abroad is compared with public diplomacy in a linear function contrasts the expectation that the more missions abroad would indicate a greater likelihood to practice public diplomacy. The codec for missions abroad that was found for countries conducting public diplomacy ( $y=1$ ) is 5, which would indicate a total number of over 200 missions abroad an improbable number.
- The linear regression of technological capacity and public diplomacy supports the pattern that countries with high technological capabilities are more likely to practice public diplomacy. When  $y=1$  then the factor codec for technological capacity is 7, or the second highest codec in terms of level of technological capacity—either the MFA website has more than four languages and is smooth with limited errors (4+2) or the website has four languages and is ease to navigate with no visible errors (3+3).

The single linear regressions as functions comparing public diplomacy and each factor support the variety of conclusions from Section V.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> It should be noted that there may be some endogenous elements in the model between the factors of democracy and freedom. While both of these factors did not show a linear pattern correlating towards public diplomacy, a more thorough secondary study would seek to differentiate between them. Also, the model does not take into account some significant other factors such as whether a state is in the middle of a conflict, change over time, and other relevant variables. These issues were not ignored; rather, they were considered less vital to the current study.

## Quantitative conclusions

The quantitative analysis of public diplomacy includes several important quantitative correlations; however, these correlations must be translated into salient conclusions concerning the practice of public diplomacy. Throughout the study, the focus has been on translating and supplementing quantitative analysis with qualitative conclusions. The following table summarizes the important conclusions learned from the quantitative analysis.

Factor	Link to the practice of public diplomacy	Inferred conclusion
Wealth	Yes	PD requires a minimum of wealth
Development	No	Development does not impact PD
Size	No	A variety of different sized countries do PD
Freedom level	No	State freedom level does not necessarily indicate PD practice
Stable democracy	Questionable	Stable democracies typically do PD with important outliers
Prestige	Yes	Prestigious countries do PD
Years of open diplomacy	No	Years of membership in the UN does not dictate PD efforts
Missions abroad	No	Public diplomacy is mainly conducted through internet
Technological capacity	Yes	Countries with high tech capacity do PD

Factors which have an important quantifiable and significant relationship to the practice of public diplomacy have observable general patterns as with wealth, stable democracy (to some degree), prestige, and technological capacity. Crucial for the study are the unexpected conclusions, notably that size does not present a definitive pattern as to what sized countries conduct public diplomacy, that stable democracy suggests that democracies do practice public diplomacy but there are important outliers like China and Brunei, that years of open diplomacy or involvement in the UN does not effect whether or not a state practices public diplomacy—a state need not be a well-entrenched member of the international community to practice public

diplomacy, and that missions abroad are helpful for countries that practice public diplomacy but the internet and technological capacity matters more. Finally, neither freedom nor democracy have strong impacts on whether a state will practice public diplomacy, thereby diminishing the role of idealistic motivations for the practice of public diplomacy. To each observed pattern and expected relationship there were important qualifiers, which also reveal important elements in the practice of public diplomacy by state governments.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the study has sought to reveal, through novel quantitative analysis, the links between government-initiated public diplomacy and a variety of state characteristics or factors. The results suggest that states practice public diplomacy due primarily to rational interests, not ideals of democracy or openness; however, there is a general social trend, as predicted by normative expansion understood by the sociological, constructivist theories, towards the practice of public diplomacy. This is perhaps the most interesting conclusion of the study, going beyond the specific analysis of many interesting relationships between the practice of public diplomacy and different factors, to a general re-understanding of public diplomacy. It is the general conclusion of this study that public diplomacy is no longer solely the pursuit of Western countries and great powers, as the practice public diplomacy has become prolific expanding to countries in spite of limitations in the number of years a state has been involved in the UN, the number of missions a state has abroad, or even the democratic nature of a state. In fact, there is an overwhelming impetus for countries across the globe to increase their public diplomacy efforts, as “successful public diplomacy is becoming an increasingly important asset in a globalised world....current technological and economic changes suggest that there is a pressing need for active and effective public diplomacy” (Potter, 2002). The US, European

countries, and Canada all have had many prominent case studies in the field of public diplomacy; however, there is now a need to increase attention on the public diplomacy efforts of non-traditional diplomatic powers such as China, India, Brazil, Brunei, South Africa, Romania, Sri Lanka, and Singapore. Public diplomacy is the next frontier in the practice of diplomacy, and the study of public diplomacy must match the expansion of public diplomacy in innovativeness.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Advisory Committee on Cultural Diplomacy. (2005) *Cultural Diplomacy: The Linchpin of Public Diplomacy*. 15 September. Accessed online:  
<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/54374.pdf>.
- Berridge, G.R. (2005) *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Christodoulides, Nikos. (2005) "The Internet & Diplomacy". *American Diplomacy*. 16 March. Accessed online:  
[http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2005/0103/chri/christo\\_net.html](http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2005/0103/chri/christo_net.html).
- Churchill, Winston. (1948) *The Gathering Storm*. Cambridge, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Dizard, Wilson. (2001) *Digital diplomacy : U.S. foreign policy in the information age* . London, UK: Praeger.
- Dizard, Wilson. (1961) *The strategy of truh: The story of the U.S. Information Service*. Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press.
- Durkheim, Emile. (1994) "Social facts". In Michael Martin And Lee McIntyre, eds. *Readings In The Philosophy Of Social Science*.
- Fisher, William. (2008) "Good news, bad news". OpEdNews. OpEd concerning Washington Post article "Let's talk" from 10 March. Accessed Online: <http://opednews.com/>.
- Friedman, Thomas. (2004) "War of Ideas". NYTimes. 8 January. Accessed online:  
<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9407E2DB1F39F936A15752C0A9629C8B63>.
- Fukuyama, Francis. (2006) *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York City, NY: Free Press Publisher.
- Gilboa, Eytan. (2008) "Searching for a theory of public diplomacy". The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 616 (1).
- Glassman, James. (2008) "Public Diplomacy 2.0: A new approach to global engagement". Speech by the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs. US Department of State. Address to the New America Foundation. Washington, DC. 1 December.
- Heil, Alan. (2006) "America's Vanishing Voice". Transnational Broadcasting Studies: June-December.
- Heine, Jorge. (2006) "On the Manner of Practising the New Diplomacy". Working Paper No. 11, Re-Shaping Diplomacy. Waterloo, Canada: The Centre for International Governance

---

Innovation, October. Accessed online:  
<http://www.cigionline.org/cigi/Publications/workingp/ontheman>.

Henrikson, Alan K. (2006) "What Can Public Diplomacy Achieve?". *Clingendael Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No. 104. The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations, September. Accessed online:  
<http://www.clingendael.nl/cdsp/publications/discussion%2Dpapers/list.html?id=6356&&type=summary>.

Henrikson, Alan. (2004) "Niche diplomacy in the world public arena: The global 'corners' of Canada and Norway". Jan Melissen (ed.). *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kennan, George. (1984) "Diplomacy in the Modern World". *American Diplomacy*. University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Melissen, Jan, ed. (2007) *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mercier, Alexandre. (2007) "Commercial Diplomacy in Advanced Industrial States: Canada, the UK, and the US". 12 December. Accessed online:  
<http://www.clingendael.nl/cdsp/publications/discussionpapers/archive.html?id=6726&&type=summary>.

Nicolson, Harold. (1962) *The Evolution of Diplomacy*. New York, NY: Collier Books.

Nye, Joseph. (2005) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. Public Affairs: New Edition.

Potter, Evan H. (2002) "Canada and the New Public Diplomacy". *Clingendael Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, Issue 81, July. Accessed online:  
<http://www.clingendael.nl/cdsp/publications/discussion%2Dpapers/list.html>.

Roberts, Walter. (2006) "The Evolution of Diplomacy". *Mediterranean Quarterly*. Summer. Accessed online: <http://www.publicdiplomacy.org/70.htm>.

Stephens, Oren. (1955) *Facts to a candid world*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Thomson, James. (1998) "Americans and the 'loss' of China". From *Pacific Century: The Emergence of Modern Pacific Asia*. Ed Mark Borthwick. Pacific Basin Institute: Westview Press.

## Websites

Freedomhouse: [www.freedomhouse.org](http://www.freedomhouse.org)

CIA World Factbook: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>

Diplomaticnet: <http://www.diplomaticnet.com/>

Public Diplomacy Website: [www.publicdiplomacy.org](http://www.publicdiplomacy.org)

UN Membership: <http://www.un.org/sc/members.asp>

UN Human Development Index: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/>

Internet World Stats: <http://www.internetworldstats.com/>

University of Southern California Public Diplomacy: <http://publicdiplomacy.wikia.com/wiki/>

US Institute of Peace Foreign Ministry Websites: <http://www.usip.org/library/formin.html>

---

**Annex 1: States examined**

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Aruba, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bermuda, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cote D'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Korea, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste (East Timor), Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States (US), Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

## Annex 2: Table of Public Diplomacy as the dependent variable

<b>Afghanistan</b>
Good website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.af/">http://www.mfa.gov.af/</a>
One language: English
Missions: 72-75
Yes PD
<i>Press and Information Department</i>
<i>This office is responsible for broadcasting and dissemination of foreign policy of MoFA to Afghan Representations abroad. More over, it is closely in contact with domestic and foreign media agencies and transfers all press releases, interviews, briefings of daily news and joint press releases to them. They also prepare reports of official meetings and keeping records as well as taking photos. It is comprised of translators section and technical section which perform different functions.</i>
<i>Media &amp; Relations Department</i>
<i>This office is responsible for registration of journalists who enter in Afghanistan and their agencies as well as arranging of accreditation letters to pave the ground for coverage of news, press conferences &amp; interviews with government officials.</i>
<i>Further more, sending press releases and some other information to journalists and their agencies and inviting them to attend some press conferences with the government officials are other tasks of this office. Besides, paving the ground for getting visa for those journalists whose visa dates are expired.</i>
<b>Albania</b>
Very limited website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.al/">http://www.mfa.gov.al/</a>
Languages: 4
Missions: 100+
Yes PD
<a href="http://www.mfa.gov.al/web/Department_of_Press_and_Public_Diplomacy_87_2.php">http://www.mfa.gov.al/web/Department_of_Press_and_Public_Diplomacy_87_2.php</a>
Press and Public diplomacy department
<b>Algeria</b>
Weak website: <a href="http://www.mae.dz/">http://www.mae.dz/</a>
Languages: 2
Missions: 70+
No PD
<b>Andorra</b>
No website
No PD
<b>Angola</b>
Good website: <a href="http://www.mirex.ebonet.net/">http://www.mirex.ebonet.net/</a> ; <a href="http://www.angola.org/">http://www.angola.org/</a>
2 languages: Portuguese and English
Number of missions/embassies unknown
No PD
<b>Antigua and Barbuda</b>
Good website: <a href="http://www.foreignaffairs.gov.ag/">http://www.foreignaffairs.gov.ag/</a>
One language: English
8-10 overseas missions

No PD
<b>Argentina</b> Very good website: <a href="http://www.mrecic.gov.ar/">http://www.mrecic.gov.ar/</a> Two languages Missions: 162
Yes PD <i>In 2006, The Argentine President sent out a request for proposals to all of the countries marketers and design firms for a “Contest for the Visual Identity of the Brand of Argentina.” The winning logo was adopted in 2007 along with the establishment of the Inter-Ministerial Commission of the Strategy State Argentina – Brand. “The Strategy State Brand represents different issues (characters, places, products, sub brands, activities and others) aiming to promote tourism and new investments, to spread scientific and technological abilities and the Argentine culture with its creative industries and to appreciate and make Argentine talent known abroad as an added value in itself.” The new official Promotion Portal for Argentina has web sections emphasizing a wide array of tourist opportunities, Argentine biotechnology, wines and wineries, student higher education exchange programs, business and sports. The countries Official Promotion Portal, has been named the second best website in the world among state portal websites.</i>
<b>Armenia</b> Very good website: <a href="http://www.armeniaforeignministry.am/">http://www.armeniaforeignministry.am/</a> Embassies and missions: 62 Languages: 2 (English and Armenian)
No PD There is an information and media relations bureau and the focus appears to be on issues surrounding the Armenian genocide (one ministry is the DEDICATED TO THE STUDY, RESEARCH, AND AFFIRMATION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE)
<b>Aruba</b> No website (some tourist information)
No PD
<b>Australia</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.dfat.gov.au/">http://www.dfat.gov.au/</a> Languages: 1 (English) Embassies: 180+
Yes PD <i>In 2007, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation was redesigned as ABC International, a joint enterprise of Radio Australia and Australia network. Operating with the understanding that ABC is a “major player in how our nation is represented offshore, in terms of television, radio, and online,” the corporation develops media programs for an international audience. The organization explicitly lists its functions as paralleling and supporting the government’s public diplomacy policies, specifically by addressing the following aims:</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Provide a credible, reliable and independent voice in the region</i></li> <li>• <i>Present a “window” on Australia and Australian perspectives on the world</i></li> <li>• <i>Project images and perceptions of Australia in an independent, impartial manner</i></li> <li>• <i>Foster public understanding of Australia, its people and its strategic and economic</i></li> </ul>

<p><i>interests</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Raise awareness in the region of Australia's economic and trade capabilities, including the in the education and tourism industries</i></li> </ul> <p><i>With a presence in about forty countries, radio programs in seven languages, and an estimated weekly audience of twenty million, ABC International is one of the most visible incarnations of Australian public diplomacy.</i></p>
<p><b>Austria</b></p> <p>Strong website: <a href="http://www.bmaa.gv.at/">http://www.bmaa.gv.at/</a></p> <p>Languages: 2</p> <p>PD: YES (questionable)</p> <p><i>Cultural policy division: V. Cultural Policy</i></p> <p><i>V.1 Coordination, Planning,</i>  <i>Financing and Evaluation of</i>  <i>International Cultural Policy</i></p> <p><i>V.2 Organisation of Cultural</i>  <i>and Scientific Events abroad</i></p> <p><i>V.3 Scientific-technological</i>  <i>And University Cooperation</i></p> <p><i>V.4 Multilateral</i>  <i>Cultural Policy</i>  <i>(Kulturpolitische Sektion)</i></p>
<p><b>Azerbaijan</b></p> <p>No website</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Bahamas</b></p> <p>Limited website (tourism)</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Bahrain</b></p> <p>Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.bh/MOFA/intro.html">http://www.mofa.gov.bh/MOFA/intro.html</a></p> <p>Languages: 2 (English and Arabic)</p> <p>Embassies: Unknown</p> <p>Yes PD  <a href="http://www.info.gov.bh/en/PublicRelation/">http://www.info.gov.bh/en/PublicRelation/</a></p>
<p><b>Bangladesh</b></p> <p>Very good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.bd/">http://www.mofa.gov.bd/</a></p> <p>Languages: one (English)</p> <p>Embassies: 53</p> <p>No PD</p> <p>There is an <i>EXTERNAL PUBLICITY WING: Mr. Muhammad Imran Director-General 956-2118</i>  <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.bd/officers_foreign.htm">http://www.mofa.gov.bd/officers_foreign.htm</a></p>
<p><b>Barbados</b></p> <p>Good website, tourist oriented: <a href="http://www.foreign.gov.bb/">http://www.foreign.gov.bb/</a></p>

<p>Languages: just English</p> <p>No PD</p> <p>There is a ministry division of public affairs but no one occupying the post</p>
<p><b>Belarus</b></p> <p>Mediocre website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.by/">http://www.mfa.gov.by/</a> ; <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.by/en/">http://www.mfa.gov.by/en/</a></p> <p>Languages: 2 (English and Russian)</p> <p>No PD</p> <p>Some with Russia but otherwise not</p>
<p><b>Belgium</b></p> <p>Excellent website: <a href="http://www.diplomatie.be/languagechoice.asp">http://www.diplomatie.be/languagechoice.asp</a></p> <p>Languages: 4</p> <p>Embassies and consulates: 115+</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Belize</b></p> <p>Weak website: <a href="http://www.governmentofbelize.gov.bz/">http://www.governmentofbelize.gov.bz/</a></p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Benin</b></p> <p>Poor website: <a href="http://www.gouv.bj/">http://www.gouv.bj/</a></p> <p>On language: French</p> <p>No PD</p> <p>Government agency for media but not really for PD: <a href="http://www.gouv.bj/spip.php?article28">http://www.gouv.bj/spip.php?article28</a></p>
<p><b>Bermuda</b></p> <p>Decent website: <a href="http://www.gov.bm/portal/server.pt">http://www.gov.bm/portal/server.pt</a></p> <p>Mostly English</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Bhutan</b></p> <p>Website not operational: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.bt/">http://www.mfa.gov.bt/</a></p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Bolivia</b></p> <p>Website mediocre: <a href="http://www.bolivia.gov.bo/">http://www.bolivia.gov.bo/</a></p> <p>One language</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Bosnia-Herzegovina</b></p> <p>Website good: <a href="http://www.fbihvlada.gov.ba/english/index.php">http://www.fbihvlada.gov.ba/english/index.php</a></p> <p>4 languages</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Botswana</b></p>

Poor website: <a href="http://www.gov.bw/">http://www.gov.bw/</a> One language  No PD
<b>Brazil</b>  Yes PD
<b>Brunei</b>  Yes PD
<b>Bulgaria</b> Strong website: <a href="http://www.mfa.bg/en/index.php?option=com_selfpage&amp;Itemid=253">http://www.mfa.bg/en/index.php?option=com_selfpage&amp;Itemid=253</a> Languages: 2 75+ embassies  Yes PD With respect to EU through RadioBulgaria
<b>Burkina Faso</b> Mediocre website: <a href="http://www.mae.gov.bf/SiteMae/index.jsp">http://www.mae.gov.bf/SiteMae/index.jsp</a> One language (French) 28 major embassies  No PD but there is an agency for “cultural cooperation”: <i>L'Agence burkinabè de coopération technique et culturelle</i> <i>Elle est chargée de la promotion et de la valorisation des compétences et de l'expertise nationales sur les plans régional et international</i>
<b>Burundi</b> No website  No PD Although there is some interest in promoting Burundi as Africa's “peace oasis” <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jqijev5X10w">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jqijev5X10w</a>
<b>Cambodia</b>  Excellent website: <a href="http://www.mfaic.gov.kh/e-visa/index.aspx">http://www.mfaic.gov.kh/e-visa/index.aspx</a> 5 languages 40+ missions  PD is limited to region (??)
<b>Cameroon</b> Poor website: <a href="http://www.spm.gov.cm/acceuil.php?lang=en">http://www.spm.gov.cm/acceuil.php?lang=en</a> Languages: French and English  No PD Ministry of External Affairs, limited information
<b>Canada</b> Excellent website

Yes PD
<b>Cape Verde</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.governo.cv/">http://www.governo.cv/</a> Three languages
No PD
<b>Central African Republic</b> No website
No PD
<b>Chad</b> Limited site: <a href="http://www.primature-tchad.org/">http://www.primature-tchad.org/</a> One language (French) 30 embassies
No PD
<b>Chile</b> Very good website: <a href="http://www.minrel.gov.cl/prontus_minrel/site/edic/base/port/home.php">http://www.minrel.gov.cl/prontus_minrel/site/edic/base/port/home.php</a> Two languages of English and Spanish 120+ missions and consulates
Yes PD Ministry of Press and Culture: <a href="http://www.minrel.gov.cl/prontus_minrel/site/artic/20081013/pags/20081013163004.php">http://www.minrel.gov.cl/prontus_minrel/site/artic/20081013/pags/20081013163004.php</a> Diplomatic academy with <i>outreach and promotion activities</i>
<b>China</b>
Yes PD
<b>Colombia</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.cancilleria.gov.co/wps/portal">http://www.cancilleria.gov.co/wps/portal</a> One language (Spanish) 70+ embassies
No PD External ministry statement of mission: <a href="http://www.cancilleria.gov.co/WebContentManager/webapp/display.jsp?sid=281474976713774&amp;pid=19475">http://www.cancilleria.gov.co/WebContentManager/webapp/display.jsp?sid=281474976713774&amp;pid=19475</a>
<b>Comoros</b> No website
No PD
<b>Costa Rica</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.rree.go.cr/">http://www.rree.go.cr/</a> One language: Spanish 40+ embassies
No PD

<b>Cote D'Ivoire</b> No website  No PD
<b>Croatia</b> Excellent website: <a href="http://www.mvpei.hr/MVP.asp?pcpid=1612">http://www.mvpei.hr/MVP.asp?pcpid=1612</a> One language (English) Missions: 220+  Yes PD <i>State's image is an important factor in international relations, and can contribute a great deal to the realisation of certain foreign policy goals. That is why the Croatian government will work on presenting Croatia to the world, strengthening its national identity and creating an image of Croatia as a modern, dynamic, democratic and tolerant Mediterranean and Central European state, whereby one of the key activities will be the cultural promotion of Croatia.</i> ( <a href="http://www.mvpei.hr/MVP.asp?pcpid=30">http://www.mvpei.hr/MVP.asp?pcpid=30</a> )
<b>Cuba</b> Good website: <a href="http://america.cubaminrex.cu/English/index.asp">http://america.cubaminrex.cu/English/index.asp</a> Two Languages: English and Spanish (with some materials in as many as 4 other languages) 133 diplomatic presences  No PD Officially “non interference” but some leader-PD
<b>Cyprus</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa2006.nsf/index_en/index_en?OpenDocument">http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa2006.nsf/index_en/index_en?OpenDocument</a> Two languages: Greek and English 135+ missions  No PD (Perhaps except on Cyprus division issue)
<b>Czech Republic</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mzv.eu/www/mzv/default.asp?idj=2&amp;amb=1">http://www.mzv.eu/www/mzv/default.asp?idj=2&amp;amb=1</a> Two languages: Czech and English 280+ missions  Yes PD <i>Radio broadcast and “Promotion Department” with the job “presentation of the Czech Republic”</i> <a href="http://www.mzv.eu/www/mzv/default.asp?ido=16626&amp;idj=2&amp;amb=1&amp;ikony=&amp;trid=1&amp;prsl=&amp;pocc1=">http://www.mzv.eu/www/mzv/default.asp?ido=16626&amp;idj=2&amp;amb=1&amp;ikony=&amp;trid=1&amp;prsl=&amp;pocc1=</a>
<b>Denmark</b> Excellent website: <a href="http://www.um.dk/en">http://www.um.dk/en</a> Two languages 150+ missions  Yes PD: <a href="http://www.um.dk/en/menu/AboutUs/PublicDiplomacy/">http://www.um.dk/en/menu/AboutUs/PublicDiplomacy/</a> Public diplomacy department
<b>Djibouti</b> Mediocre website: <a href="http://www.presidence.dj/">http://www.presidence.dj/</a> Missions unknown One language  No PD

<b>Dominica</b> Weak website(s): <a href="http://www.dominica.gov.dm/cms/index.php?q=node/200">http://www.dominica.gov.dm/cms/index.php?q=node/200</a> , <a href="http://dominica.diplomacy.edu/">http://dominica.diplomacy.edu/</a> Unknown number of missions One language  No PD
<b>Dominican Republic</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.presidencia.gob.do/app/frontpage.aspx">http://www.presidencia.gob.do/app/frontpage.aspx</a>  No PD
<b>DRC</b> No website  No PD
<b>Ecuador</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mmrree.gov.ec/">http://www.mmrree.gov.ec/</a> One language 80+ missions  No PD (??)
<b>Egypt</b> Weak website  No PD
<b>El Salvador</b> Very good website: <a href="http://www.rree.gob.sv/site/index.html">http://www.rree.gob.sv/site/index.html</a> Two languages: English and Spanish 45+ embassies/missions  Yes PD • Promote an up-to-date and positive image of the state. ( <a href="http://www.rree.gob.sv/site/politica_exterior.html">http://www.rree.gob.sv/site/politica_exterior.html</a> )
<b>Equatorial Guinea</b> Website down ( <a href="http://www.guinea-ecuatorial.net/ms/main.asp">http://www.guinea-ecuatorial.net/ms/main.asp</a> )  No PD
<b>Eritrea</b> No website  No PD
<b>Estonia</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.vm.ee/eng">http://www.vm.ee/eng</a> Two languages: English and Estonian 60+ embassies  Yes PD

<p>Hosts events abroad with the cultural bureau and “<i>Estonia is well known in the countries, regions and organisations that have direct effect on its security and welfare, and takes care of the formation of its image.</i>”</p>
<p><b>Ethiopia</b>  Decent website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.et/index.php">http://www.mfa.gov.et/index.php</a>  Four languages  62+ embassies    No PD</p>
<p><b>Fiji</b>  Weak website: <a href="http://www.foreignaffairs.gov.fj/index.php?option=com_frontpage&amp;Itemid=1">http://www.foreignaffairs.gov.fj/index.php?option=com_frontpage&amp;Itemid=1</a>  One language  15+ Missions    No PD</p>
<p><b>Finland</b>  Great website: <a href="http://formin.finland.fi/public/Default.aspx?culture=en-US&amp;contentlan=2">http://formin.finland.fi/public/Default.aspx?culture=en-US&amp;contentlan=2</a>  Three languages  180+ Missions/embassies    Yes PD  <i>“The general goal is to strengthen Finland's security and <b>international influence</b> and to promote the interests of the state, considering the requirements of increasing international cooperation.”</i></p>
<p><b>France</b>  Yes PD</p>
<p><b>Gabon</b>  No website    No PD</p>
<p><b>Gambia</b>  Mediocre website: <a href="http://www.gambia.gm/index.html">http://www.gambia.gm/index.html</a>    No PD  Some potential PD work: <a href="http://www.gambia.gm/intro.htm">http://www.gambia.gm/intro.htm</a></p>
<p><b>Georgia</b>  Very good webpage: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.ge/">http://www.mfa.gov.ge/</a>  Two languages: English and Georgian  45+ missions    No PD  There is a Department of Press and Information and Georgia places a priority on promoting democracy abroad in its mission statements; however, public diplomacy or image cultivation is not mentioned</p>
<p><b>Germany</b>  Great website: <a href="http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/en/Startseite.html">http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/en/Startseite.html</a>  5 languages</p>

Yes PD
<b>Ghana</b> Mediocre website: <a href="http://ghana.gov.gh/ministry_of_foreign_affairs Regional_cooperation_nepad">http://ghana.gov.gh/ministry_of_foreign_affairs Regional_cooperation_nepad</a> One language 45+ missions
No PD
<b>Greece</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gr/www.mfa.gr/en-US">http://www.mfa.gr/www.mfa.gr/en-US</a> Three languages: English, Greek, French 180+ Missions
Yes PD Brand Greece movement: <a href="http://www.brandinggreece.com/">http://www.brandinggreece.com/</a> Also Hellenic Foundation of Culture: <a href="http://www.hfc.gr/wmt/webpages/index.php">http://www.hfc.gr/wmt/webpages/index.php</a>
<b>Grenada</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.gov.gd/min-foreign-affairs.html">http://www.gov.gd/min-foreign-affairs.html</a> One language 10+ Missions
Yes PD “The Mission of the Ministry is to effectively promote Grenada’s interest within the Community of Nations in order to enhance its image and development.”
<b>Guatemala</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.minex.gob.gt/">http://www.minex.gob.gt/</a> One language: Spanish
No PD
<b>Guinea</b> No website
No PD
<b>Guyana</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.sdnp.org.gy/minfor/">http://www.sdnp.org.gy/minfor/</a> One language: English 75+ missions
No PD There is a Department of Public Affairs and Information: <a href="http://www.minfor.gov.gy/tsite/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=44&amp;Itemid=63">http://www.minfor.gov.gy/tsite/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=44&amp;Itemid=63</a> However it does not have the functions of public diplomacy outreach
<b>Haiti</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.haiti.org/adress~1.htm">http://www.haiti.org/adress~1.htm</a> One language: English Missions unknown
No PD

<b>Honduras</b> Website down: <a href="http://www.sre.hn/">http://www.sre.hn/</a>  No PD
<b>Hungary</b> Excellent website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.hu/kum/en/bal/">http://www.mfa.gov.hu/kum/en/bal/</a> Two languages 95+  Yes PD Department of Public Relations: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.hu/kum/en/bal/Ministry/public_relations/">http://www.mfa.gov.hu/kum/en/bal/Ministry/public_relations/</a> Also has a variety of “cultural centres”
<b>Iceland</b> Excellent website: <a href="http://www.mfa.is/">http://www.mfa.is/</a> Two languages 85+ missions  No PD
<b>India</b> Decent website: <a href="http://meaindia.nic.in/">http://meaindia.nic.in/</a> Two languages  Yes PD
<b>Indonesia</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.deplu.go.id/">http://www.deplu.go.id/</a> Two languages 135+ missions  Yes PD Special department: <a href="http://www.deplu.go.id/?category_id=24">http://www.deplu.go.id/?category_id=24</a>
<b>Iran</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.ir/cms/cms/Tehran/en/index.html">http://www.mfa.gov.ir/cms/cms/Tehran/en/index.html</a> Three languages 105+ missions  No PD
<b>Iraq</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.iq/english/home.aspx">http://www.mofa.gov.iq/english/home.aspx</a> Two languages 65+ missions  No PD Although Iraq promotes “cultural exchange” no formal PD mechanisms
<b>Ireland</b> Excellent website: <a href="http://www.dfa.ie/home/index.aspx">http://www.dfa.ie/home/index.aspx</a> One language 160+ missions

<p>Yes PD          Department dedicated to cultural diplomacy and the “promotion of Ireland abroad”:  <a href="http://www.dfa.ie/home/index.aspx?id=3031">http://www.dfa.ie/home/index.aspx?id=3031</a></p>
<p><b>Israel</b>          Excellent website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA">http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA</a>          Four languages          160 missions</p>
<p>Yes PD</p>
<p><b>Italy</b>          Excellent website: <a href="http://www.esteri.it/MAE/EN">http://www.esteri.it/MAE/EN</a>          Three (main) languages          180+ missions</p>
<p>Yes PD          Major cultural element to “promotion of Italian experience” abroad:  <a href="http://www.esteri.it/MAE/EN/Politica_Estera/Cultura/">http://www.esteri.it/MAE/EN/Politica_Estera/Cultura/</a>          Also cultural institutes</p>
<p><b>Jamaica</b>          Good website</p>
<p>Yes PD</p>
<p><b>Japan</b>          Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.go.jp/">http://www.mofa.go.jp/</a>          Two main languages          190+ missions</p>
<p>Yes PD          Japanese cultural practitioners: <a href="http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/aso/speech0604-2.html">http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/aso/speech0604-2.html</a></p>
<p><b>Jordan</b>          Mediocre website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.jo/wps/portal/FMArabicSite">http://www.mfa.gov.jo/wps/portal/FMArabicSite</a>          Two languages          15+ missions</p>
<p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Kazakhstan</b>          Good website: <a href="http://portal.mfa.kz/portal/page/portal/mfa/en/content/news/nws2009">http://portal.mfa.kz/portal/page/portal/mfa/en/content/news/nws2009</a>          Three languages          45+</p>
<p>No PD (??)</p>
<p><b>Kenya</b>          Decent website: <a href="http://www.mfa.go.ke/mfacms/">http://www.mfa.go.ke/mfacms/</a>          One language          50+ missions</p>
<p>No PD          Non-interference in the affairs of other states</p>

<b>Kuwait</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.kw/mofa_arabic/">http://www.mofa.gov.kw/mofa_arabic/</a> One language  No PD
<b>Kyrgyzstan</b> Weak website: <a href="http://mfa.kg/index_en.html">http://mfa.kg/index_en.html</a> Three languages 80+ missions  Yes PD Department dedicated to PD: <a href="http://www.mfa.kg/public-diplomacy/diplomacy_en.html">http://www.mfa.kg/public-diplomacy/diplomacy_en.html</a>
<b>Laos</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.la/">http://www.mofa.gov.la/</a> Two languages 125+ missions  No PD
<b>Latvia</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.am.gov.lv/en/">http://www.am.gov.lv/en/</a> Three languages 75+ missions  Yes PD “7. ENHANCING THE STATE'S IMAGE AND LEVEL OF RECOGNITION A key component in the image of the Latvian state is the popularisation of the country's political, economic, cultural, scientific and athletic achievements throughout the world. The government's strategic guidelines in enhancing the level of the country's positive international recognition therefore involve a varied and complex process of popularising Latvia's image.” <a href="http://www.am.gov.lv/en/policy/guidlines/#47">http://www.am.gov.lv/en/policy/guidlines/#47</a>
<b>Lebanon</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.emigrants.gov.lb/ara/index.asp">http://www.emigrants.gov.lb/ara/index.asp</a> Two languages Unknown number of missions  No PD
<b>Lesotho</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.lesotho.gov.ls/foreign/">http://www.lesotho.gov.ls/foreign/</a> One languages 150+ missions  No PD
<b>Liberia</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.lr/">http://www.mofa.gov.lr/</a> One language 20+ missions  No PD

<b>Libya</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.foreign.gov.ly/online/">http://www.foreign.gov.ly/online/</a> Four languages Unknown number of embassies  No PD
<b>Liechtenstein</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.liechtenstein.li/en/eliechtenstein_main_sites/portal_fuerstentum_liechtenstein/fl-staat-staat/fl-staat-aussenpolitik/fl-staat-aussenpolitik-aussenministerium.htm">http://www.liechtenstein.li/en/eliechtenstein_main_sites/portal_fuerstentum_liechtenstein/fl-staat-staat/fl-staat-aussenpolitik/fl-staat-aussenpolitik-aussenministerium.htm</a> Three languages 10+ missions  No PD
<b>Lithuania</b> Excellent website: <a href="http://www.urm.lt/index.php?-2069768794">http://www.urm.lt/index.php?-2069768794</a> Four languages 100+ missions  Yes PD “to disseminate Lithuanian culture and secure a place for the Lithuanian language in the global world;” <a href="http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?nr=1&amp;item_id=8500&amp;m_e_id=4&amp;menu_i_id=162;240&amp;no_cache=1">http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?nr=1&amp;item_id=8500&amp;m_e_id=4&amp;menu_i_id=162;240&amp;no_cache=1</a>
<b>Luxembourg</b> Mediocre website: <a href="http://www.mae.lu/en/content/view/full/">http://www.mae.lu/en/content/view/full/</a> Three languages 65+ missions  No PD
<b>Macedonia</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.mk/default.aspx?ItemID=282">http://www.mfa.gov.mk/default.aspx?ItemID=282</a> Two languages 35+ missions  No PD
<b>Madagascar</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.madagascar-diplomatie.net/news.php">http://www.madagascar-diplomatie.net/news.php</a> One language Unknown number of missions  No PD
<b>Malawi</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.malawi.gov.mw/Foreign%20Affairs/Home%20ForeignAffairs.htm">http://www.malawi.gov.mw/Foreign%20Affairs/Home%20ForeignAffairs.htm</a> One language 14 missions  No PD Except: “To present and promote Malawi’s positive image internationally and maximise benefits accruing to her by virtue of her diplomatic relationship with other countries”

<b>Malaysia</b>
Good website: <a href="http://www.kln.gov.my/?page=mission">http://www.kln.gov.my/?page=mission</a>
Two languages
104 missions
Yes PD
“To carry out information activities in order to project the country's image”
<a href="http://www.kln.gov.my/?m_id=1&amp;s_id=47">http://www.kln.gov.my/?m_id=1&amp;s_id=47</a>
<b>Maldives</b>
Excellent website: <a href="http://www.foreign.gov.mv/v3/">http://www.foreign.gov.mv/v3/</a>
One language
10 missions
No PD
<b>Mali</b>
No website/website down: <a href="http://www.mae.gov.ml/">http://www.mae.gov.ml/</a>
No PD
<b>Malta</b>
Good website: <a href="http://www.foreign.gov.mt/">http://www.foreign.gov.mt/</a>
Two languages
Yes PD
Role of the MFA in “Promoting Malta's image overseas”
<b>Mauritius</b>
Decent website: <a href="http://www.gov.mu/portal/site/mfasite">http://www.gov.mu/portal/site/mfasite</a>
One language
20 missions
No PD
<b>Mexico</b>
Decent website: <a href="http://www.sre.gob.mx/english/">http://www.sre.gob.mx/english/</a>
Two languages
78+ missions
Yes PD
Some literature on Mexican PD: <a href="http://publicdiplomacy.wikia.com/wiki/Mexico">http://publicdiplomacy.wikia.com/wiki/Mexico</a>
<b>Moldova</b>
Good website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.md/En/">http://www.mfa.gov.md/En/</a>
Two languages
30+ missions
No PD
<b>Monaco</b>
Good website: <a href="http://www.relext.gouv.mc/315/wwwnew.nsf/HomeGb">http://www.relext.gouv.mc/315/wwwnew.nsf/HomeGb</a>
No PD

<b>Mongolia</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.mfat.gov.mn/">http://www.mfat.gov.mn/</a> Two languages Missions unknown
No PD
<b>Morocco</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.maec.gov.ma/en/default.html">http://www.maec.gov.ma/en/default.html</a> Three languages 85 missions
No PD Although in French the MFA describes “action culturelle”
<b>Mozambique</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.micoa.gov.mz/">http://www.micoa.gov.mz/</a> One language
No PD
<b>Myanmar</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.mm/">http://www.mofa.gov.mm/</a> One language
No PD (not functioning website)
<b>Namibia</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.na/">http://www.mfa.gov.na/</a> One language 35+ missions
No PD
<b>Nepal</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.np/">http://www.mofa.gov.np/</a> One language 30+ missions
Yes PD With the goal of “Representation of Nepal abroad” and promote Nepal’s nonaligned image.
<b>Netherlands</b> Excellent website: <a href="http://www.minbuza.nl/en/home">http://www.minbuza.nl/en/home</a> Five languages 150+ missions
Yes PD Culture and public diplomacy division: <a href="http://www.minbuza.nl/en/themes,culture-and-public-diplomacy">http://www.minbuza.nl/en/themes,culture-and-public-diplomacy</a>
<b>New Zealand</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mfat.govt.nz/">http://www.mfat.govt.nz/</a>
Yes PD

**Nicaragua**

Good website: <http://www.cancilleria.gob.ni/>

One language

45+ missions

No PD

**Niger**

Poor website: <http://www.nigerembassyusa.org/govt.html>

No PD

**Nigeria**

Decent website: <http://nigeria.gov.ng/>

One language

Yes PD

External publicity division

**North Korea**

No website

No PD

**Norway**

Excellent website: <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud.html?id=833>

Four languages

160+ missions

Yes PD

<http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/selected-topics/Public-diplomacy-and-cultural-cooperatio.html?id=434499>

**Oman**

Excellent website: <http://www.mofa.gov.om/mofanew/main.asp>

Two languages

58+ missions

No PD

**Pakistan**

Good website: <http://www.mofa.gov.pk/>

One language

110+ missions

No PD

Although some discussion of promoting “Kashmir” issues

**Panama**

Decent website: <http://www.mire.gob.pa/>

No PD

**Papua New Guinea**

Weak website: <http://www.pngembassy.org/government.html>

No PD

**Paraguay**

Website down: <http://www.mre.gov.py/>

No PD

**Peru**

Decent website: <http://www.rree.gob.pe/portal/mre.nsf/Index?OpenForm>

One language

Yes PD

Promotion of culture:

<http://www.rree.gob.pe/portal/mre.nsf/Interior?OpenAgent&5A1D9A73AC63B47A05256BAD006FF4FB|1>

**Philippines**

Great website: <http://dfa.gov.ph/>

One language

Yes PD

“To project a positive image of the Philippines” [http://dfa.gov.ph/?page\\_id=18](http://dfa.gov.ph/?page_id=18)

**Poland**

Great website: <http://www.mfa.gov.pl/>

Two languages

120+ missions

Yes PD

Culture and Public Diplomacy division: <http://www.msz.gov.pl/Structure,of,the,MFA,22701.html>

**Portugal**

Good website: <http://www.mne.gov.pt/mne/en/>

Two languages

40+ missions

No PD

**Qatar**

Decent website: <http://english.mofa.gov.qa/index.cfm>

Two languages

No PD

**Romania**

Excellent website: <http://www.mae.ro/index.php?lang=en>

Five languages

Yes PD

**Russia**

Weak website: [http://www.mid.ru/bul\\_ns\\_en.nsf/kartaflat/en01](http://www.mid.ru/bul_ns_en.nsf/kartaflat/en01)

Five languages

Yes PD
<p><b>Rwanda</b>  Weak website: <a href="http://www.minaffet.gov.rw/">http://www.minaffet.gov.rw/</a>  One language</p> <p>Yes PD  Desire to “Present a positive image of Rwanda in such a way as to correct the outside world’s wrong perception of the unity and history of the Rwandan people, this being a die-hard colonial legacy”  <a href="http://www.minaffet.gov.rw/content/view/44/46/lang.english/">http://www.minaffet.gov.rw/content/view/44/46/lang.english/</a></p>
<p><b>Samoa</b>  Decent website: <a href="http://www.mfat.gov.ws/">http://www.mfat.gov.ws/</a>  One language  14+ missions</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Saudi Arabia</b>  Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.sa/detail.asp?InServiceID=205&amp;intemplatekey=MainPage">http://www.mofa.gov.sa/detail.asp?InServiceID=205&amp;intemplatekey=MainPage</a>  Three languages  150+ missions</p> <p>Yes PD  <a href="http://www.saudinf.com/">http://www.saudinf.com/</a></p>
<p><b>Senegal</b>  Decent website: <a href="http://www.diplomatie.gouv.sn/">http://www.diplomatie.gouv.sn/</a>  One language  20+ missions</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Serbia</b>  Good website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.yu/">http://www.mfa.gov.yu/</a>  One language  75+ missions</p> <p>Yes PD  Department dedicated to public diplomacy: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.yu/Pressframe.htm">http://www.mfa.gov.yu/Pressframe.htm</a></p>
<p><b>Seychelles</b>  Excellent website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.sc/">http://www.mfa.gov.sc/</a>  Two languages  75+ missions</p> <p>Yes PD  “images actively promoted by our government agencies and representatives, have increasingly put Seychelles on the World map.” <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.sc/Ministry_ForeignPolicy.htm#">http://www.mfa.gov.sc/Ministry_ForeignPolicy.htm#</a></p>
<p><b>Sierra Leone</b>  Weak website: <a href="http://www.daco-sl.org/encyclopedia/1_gov/1_2mfa.htm">http://www.daco-sl.org/encyclopedia/1_gov/1_2mfa.htm</a>  One language  15+ missions</p>

No PD
<b>Singapore</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.sg/internet/">http://www.mfa.gov.sg/internet/</a> One language 140+ missions
Yes PD
<b>Slovakia</b> Mediocre website: <a href="http://www.mzv.sk">http://www.mzv.sk</a> Three languages
Yes PD Directorate general for public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy
<b>Slovenia</b> Great website: <a href="http://www.mzz.gov.si/en">http://www.mzz.gov.si/en</a> Five languages 170+ missions
Yes PD
<b>Solomon Islands</b> No independent website
No PD
<b>Somalia</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.afdevinfo.com/htmlreports/org/org_27461.html">http://www.afdevinfo.com/htmlreports/org/org_27461.html</a> One language
No PD
<b>South Africa</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.dfa.gov.za/department/index.html">http://www.dfa.gov.za/department/index.html</a>
Yes PD
<b>South Korea</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.mofat.go.kr/english/main/index.jsp?lang=eng">http://www.mofat.go.kr/english/main/index.jsp?lang=eng</a> Two languages Missions unknown
Yes PD
<b>Spain</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.maec.es/EN/MENUPPAL/MINISTERIO/Paginas/postingTXT(17-2)Ministerio.aspx">http://www.maec.es/EN/MENUPPAL/MINISTERIO/Paginas/postingTXT(17-2)Ministerio.aspx</a> Six languages Unknown number of missions
No PD
<b>Sri Lanka</b>

Good website: <http://www.slmfa.gov.lk/>

Yes PD

**Sudan**

Website under construction: <http://www.sudanmfa.com/>

No PD

**Suriname**

No independent website

No PD

**Swaziland**

Good website: <http://www.gov.sz/home.asp?pid=60>

One language

15+ missions

No PD

**Sweden**

Great website: <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/2059>

Two languages

104 missions

Yes PD

**Switzerland**

Great website: <http://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/en/home.html>

Four languages

150+ missions

No PD

**Syria**

No website

No PD

**Tajikistan**

Good website: <http://www.mid.tj/index.php?lang=english>

Three languages

25+ missions

Yes PD

The MFA "assists in dissemination of information on foreign and domestic policies of the Republic of Tajikistan to foreign audience, including social, economic, cultural and spiritual life in the country,"

<http://www.mid.tj/index.php?node=article&id=352>

**Tanzania**

Decent website: <http://www.tanzania.go.tz/foreign.htm>

One language

25+ missions

No PD
<b>Thailand</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mfa.go.th/web/2630.php">http://www.mfa.go.th/web/2630.php</a> Two languages 100+ missions
No PD
<b>Timor-Leste (East Timor)</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.mfac.gov.tp/">http://www.mfac.gov.tp/</a> Two Languages 9 missions
No PD
<b>Togo</b> No website
No PD
<b>Tonga</b> No website
No PD
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.foreign.gov.tt/">http://www.foreign.gov.tt/</a> One language 15+ missions
No PD
<b>Tunisia</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.diplomatie.gov.tn/site/index.php?a=theme&amp;theme=24&amp;lang=2">http://www.diplomatie.gov.tn/site/index.php?a=theme&amp;theme=24&amp;lang=2</a> Three languages Missions unknown
No PD
<b>Turkey</b> Excellent website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.tr/default.en.mfa">http://www.mfa.gov.tr/default.en.mfa</a> Three languages 160+ missions
Yes PD
<b>Turkmenistan</b> Decent website: <a href="http://www.turkmenistan.gov.tm/_en/">http://www.turkmenistan.gov.tm/_en/</a> Three languages Unknown missions
No PD
<b>Uganda</b>

<p>Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.go.ug/">http://www.mofa.go.ug/</a>  One language  14+ missions</p> <p>Yes PD  “Raising Uganda’s profile internationally.”  <a href="http://www.mofa.go.ug/page2.php?1=foreign_policy&amp;&amp;2=Foreign%20Policy">http://www.mofa.go.ug/page2.php?1=foreign_policy&amp;&amp;2=Foreign%20Policy</a></p>
<p><b>Ukraine</b>  Good website: <a href="http://www.mfa.gov.ua/mfa/en/news/top.htm">http://www.mfa.gov.ua/mfa/en/news/top.htm</a>  Two languages  120+ missions</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>United Arab Emirates</b>  Weak website: <a href="http://www.government.ae/gov/en/gov/federal/mofa.jsp">http://www.government.ae/gov/en/gov/federal/mofa.jsp</a></p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>United Kingdom</b>  Excellent website: <a href="http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/">http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/</a>  Three languages  240+ missions</p> <p>Yes PD</p>
<p><b>United States</b>  Excellent website: <a href="http://www.state.gov/">http://www.state.gov/</a></p> <p>Yes PD</p>
<p><b>Uruguay</b>  Good website: <a href="http://www.mrree.gub.uy/mrree/home.htm">http://www.mrree.gub.uy/mrree/home.htm</a>  One language  140+ missions</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Uzbekistan</b>  Good website: <a href="http://mfa.uz/eng/">http://mfa.uz/eng/</a>  Three languages  45 missions</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Vanuatu</b>  No website</p> <p>No PD</p>
<p><b>Venezuela</b>  Decent website: <a href="http://www.mre.gov.ve/metadot/index.pl">http://www.mre.gov.ve/metadot/index.pl</a>  One language  80+ missions</p>

Yes PD
<b>Vietnam</b> Good website: <a href="http://www.mofa.gov.vn/en">http://www.mofa.gov.vn/en</a> Two languages 82 missions
No PD
<b>Yemen</b> No website
No PD
<b>Zambia</b> No website
No PD
<b>Zimbabwe</b> Weak website: <a href="http://www.zimfa.gov.zw/">http://www.zimfa.gov.zw/</a> One language 40+ missions  Yes PD “to protect a positive image of Zimbabwe abroad;” <a href="http://www.zimfa.gov.zw/about/objective.htm">http://www.zimfa.gov.zw/about/objective.htm</a>

### Annex 3: Table of Factors

Country	Wealth	UNHDI	Size	Freedom	Democracy	Prestige	Missions	Years of OD	Capacity	PD
Afghanistan	1,000	NA	33 million	partly free	transitional democracy	1	75	3	3	Yes
Albania	5,800	69	3.62 million	partly free	weak democracy	1	100	3	3	Yes
Algeria	6,700	104	33.8 million	not free	stable democracy	2.5	70	3	3	No
Andorra	38,800	NA	.082 million	free	monarchy/principality	1	NA	1	1	No
Angola	7,800	162	12.5 million	not free	strong presidential regime	2	NA	2	2	No
Antigua and Barbuda	18,300	57	.084 million	free	constitutional monarch	1	10	2	2	Yes
Argentina	13,100	38	40.5 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	162	3	3	Yes
Armenia	5,800	83	3 million	partly free	democracy	1	62	1	1	No
Aruba	21,800	NA	.1 million	free	stable democracy	0	NA	1	1	No
Australia	37,300	3	21 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	180	3	3	Yes
Austria	39,300	15	8.2 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	168	3	3	Yes
Azerbaijan	8,000	98	8.18 million	not free	unstable democracy	1	NA	1	1	No
Bahamas	28,000	49	.3 million	free	stable democracy	1	NA	2	2	No
Bahrain	33,900	41	.72 million	partly free	constitutional monarch	2	NA	2	2	Yes
Bangladesh	1,400	140	153.5 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2	53	2	2	No
Barbados	18,900	31	0.281 million	free	stable democracy	1	NA	3	3	No
Belarus	10,600	46	9.68 million	not free	dictatorship	2	NA	2	2	No
Belgium	36,200	17	10.4 million	free	democracy	2.5	115	3	3	No
Belize	7,900	80	.3 million	free	monarchy	1	NA	2	2	No
Benin	1,400	163	8.5 million	free	weak democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Bermuda	69,900	NA	.066 million	free	weak democracy	0	NA	1	1	No
Bhutan	5,200	133	.682 million	not free	weak democracy	1	NA	2	2	No
Bolivia	4,400	117	9.2 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Bosnia-Herzegovina	6,100	66	4.6 million	partly free	unstable democracy	1	NA	1	1	No
Botswana	14,300	124	1.8 million	free	unstable democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Brazil	8,800	69	190 million	Free	Federal republic	3	111	3	3	No
Brunei	25,600	34	375 thousand	Not Free	Constitutional sultanate	1	24	2	2	Yes
Bulgaria	11,800	53	7.3 million	free	weak democracy	2.5	75	3	3	Yes
Burkina Faso	1,200	176	15.3 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	28	3	3	Yes
Burundi	300	167	8.7 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Cambodia	1,900	131	14.2 million	not free	weak democracy	1	40	3	3	No
Cameroon	2,200	144	18.5 million	not free	unstable democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Canada	35,700	6	33 million	Free	Parliamentary democracy	2.5	148	3	3	Yes
Cape Verde	3,200	102	.43 million	free	stable democracy	2	NA	2	2	No
Central African Rep	700	171	4.4 million	partly free	unstable democracy	1	NA	3	3	No
Chad	1,500	170	10.1 million	not free	unstable democracy	1	30	3	3	No
Chile	14,300	40	16.5 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	120	3	3	Yes

Country	Wealth	UNHDI	Size	Freedom	Democracy	Prestige	Missions	Years of OD	Capacity	PD
										6
China	7,800	81	1.321 billion	Not-Free	Communist/single party	4	163	2	0	Yes
Colombia	7,400	75	45 million	partly free	weak democracy	2.5	70	3	No	No
Comoros	1,100	134	.731 million	partly free	unstable democracy	1	NA	2	No	No
Costa Rica	11,100	48	4.2 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	40	3	No	No
Cote D'Ivoire	1,600	164	18 million	Not Free	Republic	2	NA	3	0	No
Croatia	15,500	47	4.5 million	free	unstable democracy	2	220	1	Yes	Yes
Cuba	11,000	51	11.4 million	not free	communist dictatorship	2.5	133	3	No	No
Cyprus	27,100	28	.8 million	free	stable democracy	1	135	3	No	No
Czech Republic	24,500	32	10.2 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	260	1	Yes	Yes
Denmark	37,200	14	5.5 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	150	3	Yes	Yes
Djibouti	2,300	149	.5 million	partly free	stable democracy	1	NA	2	No	No
Dominica	9,000	71	.072 million	free	stable democracy	1	NA	2	No	No
Dominican Republic	6,600	79	9.5 million	free	weak democracy	1	NA	3	No	No
DRC	700	167	65.8 million	Not Free	Unstable democracy	2	NA	1	0	0
Ecuador	7,200	89	13.9 million	partly free	weak democracy	2.5	80	3	4	Mp
Egypt	4,200	111	80 million	Not Free	Republic	2.5	47	3	No	No
El Salvador	6,000	103	7 million	free	stable democracy	1	45	3	Yes	Yes
Equatorial Guinea	28,200	127	.616 million	not free	stable democracy	1	NA	2	No	No
Eritrea	800	157	5.5 million	not free	unstable democracy	1	NA	1	No	No
Estonia	21,800	44	1.3 million	free	stable democracy	1	60	1	Yes	Yes
Ethiopia	700	169	82.5 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	62	3	No	No
Fiji	3,900	93	.93 million	partly free	military democracy?	1	15	2	No	No
Finland	36,000	11	5.2 million	free	stable democracy	2	180	3	Yes	Yes
France	31,200	16	63 million	Free	Republic	4	166	3	7	Yes
Gabon	14,000	119	1.5 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	NA	3	No	No
Gambia	1,200	155	1.74 million	partly free	authoritarian??	2	NA	3	No	No
Georgia	4,400	96	4.63 million	partly free	weak democracy	1	45	1	No	No
Germany	31,900	21	82 million	Free	Federal republic	3	145	2	Yes	Yes
Ghana	1,400	135	23.4 million	free	weak democracy	2.5	NA	3	Yes	Yes
Greece	30,600	24	10.7 million	free	stable democracy	2	180	3	No	No
Grenada	10,500	82	.09 million	free	weak democracy	1	10	2	No	No
Guatemala	5,100	118	13 million	partly free	unstable democracy	1	NA	3	No	No
Guinea	1,100	160	9.8 million	not free	weak democracy	2	NA	3	No	No
Guyana	3,700	97	.77 million	free	stable democracy	2	75	3	No	No
Haiti	1,300	146	8.9 million	partly free	unstable democracy	1	NA	3	No	No
Honduras	4,300	115	7.64 million	partly free	stable democracy	2	NA	3	No	No
Hungary	19,300	36	9.93 million	free	stable democracy	2	95	3	Yes	Yes

Country	Wealth	UNHDI	Size	Freedom	Democracy	Prestige	Missions	Years of OD	Capacity	PD
Iceland	40,400	.1	.304 million	free	stable democracy	1	85	3	3	No
India	3,800	126	1.129 billion	Free	Parliamentary democracy	3	89	3	3	Yes
Indonesia	3,600	107	237.5 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	135	3	3	Yes
Iran	8,700	96	65.4 million	Not Free	Theocratic republic	2	102	3	3	No
Iraq	3,700	NA	28.2 million	not free	unstable democracy	2	65	3	3	No
Ireland	46,600	5	4.16 million	free	stable democracy	2	160	3	3	Yes
Israel	26,600	23	7.11 million	free	stable democracy	1	165	3	3	Yes
Italy	30,900	20	58.1 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	180	3	3	Yes
Jamaica	4,700	104	2.78 million	Free	Parliamentary democracy	2	19	3	3	Yes
Japan	33,500	8	127.3 million	free	constitutional monarch	3	190	3	3	Yes
Jordan	4,700	86	6.2 million	partly free	constitutional monarch	2	15	3	3	No
Kazakhstan	11,000	73	15.3 million	not free	weak democracy	1	45	1	1	No
Kenya	1,700	148	38 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	50	3	3	No
Kuwait	55,900	33	2.6 million	partly free	constitutional emirate	2	NA	3	3	No
Kyrgyzstan	2,000	2,000	5.4 million	partly free	weak democracy	1	80	1	1	Yes
Laos	500	130	6.68 million	not free	communist state	1	125	3	3	No
Latvia	17,700	45	2.25 million	free	stable democracy	2	75	1	1	Yes
Lebanon	10,300	88	3.9 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Lesotho	1,400	138	2.13 million	free	weak democracy	1	150	3	3	No
Liberia	500	NA	3.33 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2	20	3	3	No
Libya	12,400	56	6,173 million	not free	weak democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Liechtenstein	25,000	HIGH	.034 million	free	constitutional monarch	1	20	1	1	No
Lithuania	16,800	43	3.56 million	free	stable democracy	1	100	1	1	Yes
Luxembourg	79,400	18	.486 million	free	grand duchy	1	65	3	3	No
Macedonia	8,400	69	2.06 million	partly free	weak democracy	1	35	1	1	No
Madagascar	900	143	20.04 million	partly free	stable democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Malawi	800	164	13.93 million	partly free	stable democracy	1	14	3	3	No
Malaysia	14,500	63	25.27 million	partly free	constitutional monarch	2.5	104	3	3	No
Maldives	4,600	100	.385 million	not free	weak democracy	1	10	3	3	Yes
Mali	1,100	173	12.32 million	free	stable democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Malta	23,400	34	.403 million	free	stable democracy	2	NA	3	3	Yes
Mauritius	11,300	65	1.27 million	free	stable democracy	2	20	2	2	No
Mexico	12,400	52	110 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	78	3	3	Yes
Moldova	2,300	111	4.32 million	partly free	weak democracy	1	30	1	1	No
Monaco	30,000	32 thousand	Free	Constitutional monarchy	1	NA	85	1	1	No
Mongolia	2,900	114	3 million	free	weak democracy	1	NA	3	3	No
Morocco	3,700	126	34.3 million	partly free	stable democracy	2	NA	0	0	No

Country	Wealth	UNHDI	Size	Freedom	Democracy	Prestige	Missions	Years of OD	Capacity	PD
Mozambique	800	172	21.2 million	partly free	weak democracy	1	NA	2	No	No
Myanmar	1,900	132	47.8 million	not free	authoritarian??	1	NA	3	No	No
Namibia	5,200	125	2.08 million	free	stable democracy	2	35	1	Yes	Yes
Nepal	1,000	142	29.5 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2	30	3	Yes	Yes
Netherlands	39,000	9	16.6 million	free	constitutional monarch	2.5	150	3	No	No
New Zealand	26,200	20	4.1 million	Free	Parliamentary democracy	2.5	195	3	Yes	Yes
Nicaragua	2,800	110	5.79 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	NA	3	No	No
Niger	700	174	13.2 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2	NA	3	Yes	Yes
Nigeria	2,100	158	14.6 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2.5	NA	3	No	No
North Korea	1,700	NA	23.5 million	not free	authoritarian??	1	NA	1	Yes	Yes
Norway	53,300	2	4.64 million	free	constitutional monarch	2.5	160	3	No	Yes
Oman	19,000	58	3.31 million	not free	sultanate	2	58	2	No	No
Pakistan	2,400	136	172.8 million	not free	unstable democracy	2.5	110	3	No	No
Panama	8,200	58	3.24 million	Free	constitutional democracy	2.5	6	3	Yes	Yes
Papua New Guinea	2,100	145	5.9 million	partly free	stable democracy	1	NA	2	No	No
Paraguay	4,000	95	6.83 million	partly free	stable democracy	2	NA	3	No	No
Peru	7,600	87	29.2 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	NA	3	Yes	Yes
Philippines	3,200	90	96.2 million	partly free	weak democracy	2.5	NA	3	No	No
Poland	16,200	37	38.5 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	120	3	Yes	Yes
Portugal	21,800	29	10.7 million	free	stable democracy	2	40	3	No	No
Qatar	87,600	35	.824 million	not free	emirate	2	NA	2	No	No
Romania	9,100	60	22.3 million	Free	Republic	2.5	30	3	Yes	Yes
Russia	12,200	65	14.2 million	Not Free	Democratic federation	4	NA	3	Yes	Yes
Rwanda	800	161	10.2 million	not free	unstable democracy	2	NA	3	Yes	Yes
Samoa	5,400	77	2.17 million	free	stable democracy	1	14	2	No	No
Saudi Arabia	19,800	61	28.15 million	not free	constitutional monarch	1	150	3	Yes	Yes
Senegal	1,700	156	12.85 million	free	weak democracy	2	20	3	No	No
Serbia	10,400	NA	10.16 million	free	weak democracy	1	75	1	Yes	Yes
Seychelles	16,600	50	.082 million	partly free	stable democracy	1	75	2	Yes	Yes
Sierra Leone	600	177	6.3 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2	15	3	No	No
Singapore	31,400	25	4.5 million	partially Free	Parliamentary democracy	2	39	3	Yes	Yes
Slovakia	20,200	42	5.5 million	free	stable democracy	2	NA	3	Yes	Yes
Slovenia	28,000	27	2 million	free	stable democracy	2	160	1	No	No
Solomon Islands	1,900	129	.581 million	partly free	weak democracy	1	NA	2	Yes	Yes
Somalia	600	NA	9.56 million	not free	failed state	2	NA	3	No	No
South Africa	13,300	121	44 million	Free	Republic	2.5	51	3	Yes	Yes
South Korea	25,000	26	48.4 million	free	stable democracy	2	NA	1	Yes	Yes

Country	Wealth	UNHDI	Size	Freedom	Democracy	Prestige	Missions	Years of OD	Capacity	PD
Spain	33,600	13	40.5 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	NA	3	3	No
Sri Lanka	4,700	93	20.9 million	Partially Free	Republic in crisis	2	46	3	3	Yes
Sudan	1,900	147	40.2 million	not free	unstable democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Suriname	8,700	85	.475 million	free	stable democracy	1	NA	2	2	No
Swaziland	4,700	141	1.1 million	not free	weak democracy	1	15	2	2	No
Sweden	37,500	6	9 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	104	3	3	Yes
Switzerland	40,100	7	7.6 million	free	stable democracy	1	150	1	1	No
Syria	4,700	108	19.7 million	not free	weak democracy	2.5	NA	3	3	No
Tajikistan	1,600	122	7.2 million	not free	failed state	1	25	1	1	Yes
Tanzania	1,300	159	40.2 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2	28	3	3	No
Thailand	8,000	78	65.5 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	110	3	3	No
Timor-Leste	2,500	150	1.1 million	partly free	unstable democracy	1	9	1	1	No
Togo	900	152	5.9 million	partly free	weak democracy	2	NA	3	3	No
Tonga	5,100	55	.12 million	partly free	monarchy	1	NA	1	1	No
Trinidad and Tobago	25,400	59	1 million	free	stable democracy	2	15	3	3	No
Tunisia	7,400	91	10.4 million	not free	weak democracy	2.5	NA	3	3	No
Turkey	12,000	84	72 million	partly free	stable democracy	2.5	160	3	3	No
Turkmenistan	5,300	109	5.2 million	not free	unstable democracy	1	NA	1	1	No
Uganda	1,000	154	31 million	partly free	stable democracy	2.5	14	3	3	No
Ukraine	7,000	76	46 million	free	stable democracy	2.5	120	3	3	Yes
United Arab Emirates	37,000	39	4.6 million	not free	weak democracy	2	NA	2	2	No
United Kingdom	35,000	16	61 million	free	constitutional monarch	4	240	3	3	Yes
United States	43,800	8	300 million	Free	Presidential democracy	4	278	3	3	No
Uruguay	10,800	46	3.5 million	free	stable democracy	2	140	3	3	No
Uzbekistan	2,000	113	27.8 million	Not Free	republic with authoritarianism	1	NA	1	1	Yes
Vanuatu	3,900	120	.215 million	free	stable democracy	1	NA	2	2	No
Venezuela	12,800	74	26.4 million	partly free	dictatorship/authoritarian regime	2.5	80	3	3	Yes
Vietnam	3,100	109	85.3 million	Not Free	Communist/single party	2	75	2	2	No
Yemen	2,500	153	23 million	partly free	weak democracy	3	NA	3	3	No
Zambia	1,400	165	11.7 million	partly free	unstable democracy	2.5	NA	2	2	No
Zimbabwe	200	151	11.4 million	not free	unstable democracy	2	40	2	2	Yes

## Annex 4: Regression Analysis

### SUMMARY OUTPUT (Wealth)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.328273564
R Square	0.107763533
Adjusted R Square	0.102722649
Standard Error	0.456810355
Observations	179

### ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	1	4.461049045	4.461049045	21.37790377	7.25091E-06
Residual	177	36.935599	0.208675701		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.080062794	0.070099005	1.142138813	0.254939012	0.058274647	0.218400235
Wealth	0.098962422	0.021403646	4.623624527	7.25091E-06	0.056723226	0.141201617

### SUMMARY OUTPUT (Development)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.337375833
R Square	0.113822452
Adjusted R Square	0.1088158
Standard Error	0.45525668
Observations	179

### ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	1	4.711868002	4.711868002	22.73424116	3.86917E-06
Residual	177	36.68478004	0.207258644		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.035256158	0.090216315	0.390795811	0.69641814	0.213294265	0.142781945
Development	0.105178248	0.022058994	4.768043746	3.86917E-06	0.06164575	0.148710746

## SUMMARY OUTPUT (Size)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.314870844
R Square	0.099143649
Adjusted R Square	0.094054065
Standard Error	0.459011671
Observations	179

## ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	1	4.104214724	4.104214724	19.47971589	1.76372E-05
Residual	177	37.29243332	0.210691714		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.01617265	0.085771358	0.188555364	0.850657333	0.153093522	0.185438821
Size	0.139562013	0.031621023	4.413583113	1.76372E-05	0.077159253	0.201964773

## SUMMARY OUTPUT (Freedom)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.338084913
R Square	0.114301408
Adjusted R Square	0.109297462
Standard Error	0.455133636
Observations	179

## ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	1	4.731695174	4.731695174	22.84225071	3.68131E-06
Residual	177	36.66495287	0.207146626		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.079977149	0.098756434	0.809842423	0.419118147	0.274868822	0.114914523
Freedom	0.200799771	0.042013974	4.779356726	3.68131E-06	0.117886958	0.283712585

## SUMMARY OUTPUT (Democracy)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.302581058
R Square	0.091555297
Adjusted R Square	0.086422841
Standard Error	0.460940856
Observations	179

## ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>Significance</i>	
				<i>F</i>	<i>F</i>
Regression	1	3.790082388	3.790082388	17.83849631	3.84136E-05
Residual	177	37.60656566	0.212466473		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.232323232	0.046326299	5.014931841	1.28185E-06	0.140900228	0.323746237
Democracy	0.292676768	0.069296154	4.223564408	3.84136E-05	0.15592372	0.429429815

## SUMMARY OUTPUT (Prestige)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.404369383
R Square	0.163514598
Adjusted R Square	0.158788692
Standard Error	0.44230835
Observations	179

## ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>Significance</i>	
				<i>F</i>	<i>F</i>
Regression	1	6.768956259	6.768956259	34.59962811	1.9792E-08
Residual	177	34.62769179	0.195636677		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.118905459	0.08836587	1.345603898	0.180151475	0.293291789	0.055480872
Prestige	0.261863663	0.044518398	5.882144856	1.9792E-08	0.174008476	0.349718851

SUMMARY OUTPUT (Years of  
OD)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.16693732
R Square	0.027868069
Adjusted R Square	0.022375798
Standard Error	0.476824497
Observations	179

ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	1	1.153644632	1.153644632	5.074052195	0.02551476
Residual	177	40.24300341	0.227361601		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.115358362	0.115624371	0.997699367	0.319787153	0.112821476	0.3435382
Years of OD	0.100341297	0.044545337	2.252565692	0.02551476	0.012432947	0.188249647

SUMMARY OUTPUT (Tech Capacity)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.513154192
R Square	0.263327225
Adjusted R Square	0.259165232
Standard Error	0.415081393
Observations	179

ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	1	10.90086445	10.90086445	63.2695009	2.0623E-13
Residual	177	30.49578359	0.172292563		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.021684372	0.052964015	0.409417075	0.68272863	0.082837885	0.126206629
Tech Capacity	0.133446501	0.016776833	7.954212777	2.0623E-13	0.100338126	0.166554876

## SUMMARY OUTPUT (Multiple Regression)

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.625769143
R Square	0.391587021
Adjusted R Square	0.362955822
Standard Error	0.384908377
Observations	179

## ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	8	16.21039008	2.02629876	13.67693405	3.15818E-15
Residual	170	25.18625797	0.148154459		
Total	178	41.39664804			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	0.540497903	0.152446075	3.545502265	0.000506351	0.841429096	0.239566711
Wealth	0.027758995	0.034654982	0.801010234	0.42424381	-0.04065054	0.09616853
Development	0.022467833	0.036984533	0.607492687	0.544334604	0.095475942	0.050540276
Size	0.062551579	0.038736413	1.614800507	0.10820839	0.013914771	0.139017929
Freedom	0.139259166	0.047255287	2.94695415	0.003660048	0.045976409	0.232541922
Democracy	0.030972895	0.075831676	0.408442704	0.6834627	0.118720147	0.180665936
Prestige	0.108413138	0.062709219	1.72882298	0.085656254	0.015375946	0.232202222
Years of OD	-0.00295263	0.044225373	-0.06676325	0.946848634	0.090254281	0.084349022
Tech Capacity	0.093956307	0.01956233	4.802920169	3.41384E-06	0.05533993	0.132572685