

PRL 602: INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND COMMUNICATIONS

SUMMER 2008

Syracuse University
S. I. Newhouse School of Public Communications

W/F, 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM
Newhouse II, Room #391

INSTRUCTOR:

Sung-Un Yang, Ph.D.
Assistant professor
381-NH2

Phone: 443-9347

Email: suyang@syr.edu, sungpal2002@gmail.com

Office Hours (seven hours per week): TH 10:00 am to 12:00 pm, TH 1:00 pm to 4:00pm, & F 10:00 am to 12:00 pm (Or by appointment)

REQUIRED BOOKS:

Botan, C. H., & Hazleton, V. (2006). *Public relations theory II*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. [ISBN 0-8058-3385-4 (paper)]

Nye, J. S. (2005). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs. [ISBN 978-1-58648-306-7]

BLACKBOARD/COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE INSTRUCTOR:

This course will be supported by a web-based program, Blackboard. You will need a “syr.edu” mail account in order to access important course information, lectures and required readings. A great deal of information will be communicated by e-mail. Therefore, you are responsible for checking your e-mail regularly to keep up with course information.

As a Syracuse University student, you have immediate and automatic access to the Blackboard system. *You must use your NetID (the part your SU e-mail put before @syr.edu) and password (SU e-mail password) to access this site, and you must use your SU e-mail account (the one that ends in @syr.edu) to receive information related to the course.*

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

The course will serve as the gateway course for the two-degree program in the Theory and Practice of Public Diplomacy. Students will be introduced to graduate study in Public Relations, International Relations and where the two programs intersect. This intersection is Public Diplomacy. Public Diplomacy has evolved beyond the traditional government sponsored activities to promote the national interests of a nation state and now includes non-governmental communications that impact governments, as well as governmental communications that affect non-governmental sectors. An overview of basic, yet fundamental topics in Public Relations and International Relations will be explored.

FORMAT:

The seminar will meet during Summer Session II. Students will be responsible for keeping up with the readings, making selected presentations, participating in discussions, completing exams, and researching and presenting the final case study.

PARTICIPANTS:

The seminar is a required course in the proposed Theory and Practice of Public Diplomacy program. Increasingly, employers in government, international organizations, not-for-profit organizations and the NGO community, as well as the private sector, are looking for people who understand diverse audiences at home abroad and are skillful at crafting messages that describe the organization, convey its vision, and help the organization to communicate its message in times of change or crisis. Every organization, regardless of its size or mission, needs people who have the training and skills to build relationships and to create and sustain an effective dialogue with external audiences.

Participants should include students interested in careers in public diplomacy and public communications, including varied NGOs, advocacy (e.g. lobbying, public policy and public interest) constituency and professional associations, corporate representation, social service, reform groups, government consulting, national security/foreign policy agencies and international elements of U.S. agencies.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

- To introduce students to the role that public relations and international relations play in public diplomacy.
- To increase understanding of the “new” field of Public Diplomacy.
- To allow students to begin thinking about and to start identifying specific areas of interest in public diplomacy.

- To improve secondary research skills.
- To prepare students for success in the two-degree program by introducing them to the fundamental concepts, ideas, and topic areas in public relations and international relations for public diplomacy.

HOW WILL FINAL GRADES BE ESTABLISHED?

• Reaction papers about the readings (2 points for each)	14 points	0.7%
• Seminar discussion	40 points	20%
• Book report	20 points	10%
• Exam 1	40 points	20%
• Exam 2	40 points	20%
• Final case study presentation	40 points	20%
• Class participation	6 points	0.3%

Total = 200 points (100%)

Final grades will be determined by adding up the points for each assignment and using the following letter grade scale:

185-200 = A	165-173 = B	145-153 = C
180-184 = A-	160-164 = B-	140-144 = C-
174-179 = B+	154-159 = C+	000-139 = F

ASSIGNMENTS:

There are following required assignments for the course. They include:

1. Submitting reaction papers about the readings for each of the 7 seminar topics
2. Presiding seminar discussion as groups
3. Presenting a book on Public Diplomacy
4. Presenting a case study (term project)

Reaction papers (14 points in total):

Reactions papers are due for each of the 7 seminar topics. As your “thought pieces,” reaction papers are meant to get you to think about the readings critically, and perhaps in more detail than you would normally. They also are meant to prepare you for participating in class discussions. The exact content of these reaction papers is largely up to you (i.e., don’t need to address all readings), while you should read all required readings and write these papers.

For example, it could consist of a summary of the reading(s), an elaboration of one or more of the concepts addressed in the readings, an argument against conclusions drawn by the author(s), a pro/con critique of the readings, or an attempt to relate it to other readings that have been assigned.

These reaction papers are due by 10 am on the day when the seminar topic is covered. This means that you must stay on top of the reading. Reaction papers are to be typed and double-spaced (maximum, two pages). Grading: Completion-Based.

Seminar discussion (40 points in total):

Class participation is crucial to the success of a seminar. Class participation includes students' role as discussion leader for a seminar topic and involvement in class discussions and exercises.

As a group of three to two students, students will be responsible for presiding discussion for a seminar topic (see Appendix A for the group formation).

1. Presenting overview about a seminar topic (15 points; duration of 30 minute):

Discussion leaders will present the overview of all required readings. Additionally, each group of discussion leaders is responsible for finding at least one additional article related to the topic and presenting the article(s) as well. The new reading(s) should be sent electronically to the instructor and students at least one day before the seminar class. Grading Options: Excellent (15 points); Good (13 points); & Fair (11 points). Power Point presentation will be highly recommended.

2. Presiding discussion (15 points; duration of 30 minutes):

Each group will be responsible for developing discussion questions. Please put those discussion questions at the end of presentation slides. Students are most welcomed to get the instructor's feedback about discussion questions in prior to the class. In developing discussion questions, please keep the discussion duration in mind. To get the assigned grade, discussion leaders are responsible for leading active, interactive discussion at least for the duration of half an hour. Grading Options: Excellent (15 points); Good (13 points); & Fair (11 points). For grading, please send the PowerPoint to the instructor promptly after the class; I will post it on Blackboard for others to review it.

3. Writing essay exam questions (10 points as completion-based):

For both of two essay in-class exams, the instructor will use exam questions written by each discussion leader. Each team of discussion leaders can write (1) a grand essay question to include most readings or (2) 2-3 short essay questions to reflect particular readings. The instructor will edit the questions and can use them selectively for both exams. Discussion leaders should send exam questions to the instructor via e-mail before the beginning of the

class when the topic will be discussed. If students' exam questions are selected for the actual exams, 2 bonus points will be added to the final grade; hence, please do your best to submit quality exam questions. Grading: Completion-Based (plus 2 bonus points if eligible).

Book report (20 points; duration of 20 minutes for presentation & 10 minutes for discussion):

Students will be responsible to report a selected book about Public Diplomacy. Power point presentation is highly preferred. Regardless of the format of presentation, students need to prepare a handout for their presentations. Presentation duration is 20 minutes. In the handout, students also need to include discussion questions about the book presented. After presentation, class discussion on the book will be made for 10 minutes using the discussion questions. Grading Options: Excellent (20 points); Good (18 points); & Fair (16 points). For grading, please send the PowerPoint to the instructor promptly after the class; I will post it on Blackboard for others to review it.

In-class essay exams (40 points for each exam):

Students will have two in-class essay exams about the readings of this course. The instructor will reserve a lab for exams that will be held for 2 hours. Both exams will be closed book only with annotated bibliography for the readings. By writing quality reaction papers for each topic of the class and active involvement in discussions, students can ensure good grades from exams.

Case study (final term project; 40 points):

Students will have to present a case study about a Public Diplomacy case of their choice. A historical case can be acceptable if the case seems to have relevancy to today's Public Diplomacy practice. Otherwise, it is recommended to select a contemporary case or even an on-going case. The scope of the case can be a U.S.-based case or an international/transnational case; the actors of the case can be any PD actor—such as governments, international organizations, not-for-profit organizations, the NGO community, and global corporations. Grading Options: Excellent (40 points); Good (36 points); & Fair (32 points).

For examples, students in last year's class had the following topics for their final case studies:

Bulgaria's Accession to the EU; Chinese Soft Power & the 2008 Olympic; HSBC Branding by Global Corporate Social Responsibility; Israel vs. Everyone Else; National Building in Estonia; The Relation Between Public Diplomacy and Nation Building: A Case of Singapore; Revisited South Korean Soft Power: A Case of National Identity Discord; Use of Social Network Media for Public Diplomacy; The Dream Act: A Case of Public Diplomacy with Domestic Publics.

Note: The example I will use below is from a required reading on July 11 for the seminar topic three.

Taylor, M. (2000). Cultural variance as a challenge to global public relations: A case study of the Coca-Cola scare in Europe. *Public Relations Review*, 26(3), 277-293.

1. Part One—Introduction:

Background statement: the section of a research project that sets the stage for the research problem. The background information can include a perspective on the lack of information available on some topic; how you got interested in the topic area or how the topic and the lack of information is of importance for the study and practice of Public Diplomacy.

On June 14, 1999, school children in Belgium became ill after drinking Coca-Cola. The Belgian government ordered a recall of all bottles of Coca-Cola and banned the sale of all related Coke products. In a rush to safeguard the health of their publics, the governments of Spain and France banned the sale of Coca-Cola soft drinks. However, other nations near Belgium, including Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, did not ban sales of Coke products.

Research Problem: a description of a puzzle or a “lack of information” Most research problems start with the sentence “There is little information about...” or “I am interested in”

Why did some nations rush to ban products made by Coca-Cola while other nations waited for more information about the crisis? One answer may be found in an examination of the cultural dynamics of these six nations.

The research problem will lead you to state the purpose of the study: “what is the key purpose to study this case?”

The purpose of this article was to explore cultural variability, especially uncertainty avoidance and power distance, and to examine how it affects public response to crisis.

2. Part Two—Literature Review:

Research Questions: BROAD formally stated questions that focus your information gathering. These quests are like guidelines that direct your research effort. List your research questions (no more than 2 or 4 please). Then one-by-one, explain why you have selected them for research. In explaining your choices, tell how each research question will help you gather information you will need to solve the research problem.

Research Question: How did cultural variability (especially uncertainty avoidance and power distance) affect public response to a crisis case of the Coca-Cola scare in 1999?

Define Your Concepts/frameworks: this is the start of your literature review. To do define your concepts, go back to research questions. Underline all of the abstract ideas contained in them.

Research Question: How did cultural variability (especially uncertainty avoidance and power distance) affect public response to a crisis case of the Coca-Cola scare in 1999?

Each of these abstract ideas is a concept or mental image. They are impossible to observe directly and may have many meanings, such as justice, social capital, or soft power. In order that you will communicate what meanings you intend for your abstract ideas, you must define them. Use your literature review and readings to do this.

Two cultural variables, uncertainty avoidance and power distance, are important cultural frameworks that help explain the disconnect between Coca-Cola's communication before, during, and after the crisis and the international publics' response to this crisis.

Then, organize the literature review section for each concept/framework in research question(s). Don't make a summary of each literature one by one; rather, make a logical synthesis of literature to elaborate on or clarify research question(s) posed by you.

The first section of the article examines the cultural dimensions—uncertainty avoidance and power distance—that can help us better understand the dynamics of organization–public relationships in international contexts.

To understand how these cultural variables affect Western European attitudes to crisis, the second section analyzes a case study of the Coca-Cola scare in 1999. This section examines cultural variance in six European nations and shows how this variance influenced public response to the Coca-Cola tainting scare.

3. Part Three—Results:

Depending on the nature of research question(s), in general, you can conduct two types of case analysis, or combination of both ways.

“Descriptive” analysis: (1) backgrounds (often with timeline), (2) identification and segmentation of key actors in the case (and their interdependence/problems/issues within the case), and (3) consequences of the case on the primary Public Diplomacy managing actor.

“Normative” analysis: (1) evaluation of success or failure of Public Diplomacy management and (2) lessons to be learned from the case (for a positive case) or suggestions about future similar cases (for a negative case). *Note:* for an on-going case, you can build a logical scenario in which you indicate possible directions/outcomes of the case.

4. Part Four—Discussion:

Students will conclude the case study with implications of this case study to the study and practice of Public Diplomacy management.

Schedule related to the case study project:

7/9 (WED): Reporting the progress of the introduction part

7/18 (FRI): Reporting the progress of the literature review part

7/25 (FRI): Reporting the progress of the results part

7/30 (WED) & 8/1 (FRI): Presentation of the case study

As for reporting the progress of each part, Please prepare “informal” presentation (i.e., no need for PowerPoint presentation) for 3 to 5 minutes. For final presentation, students need to present the case in the four required sections for 10 to 15 minutes (maximum). For grading, please send the PowerPoint to the instructor promptly after the class; I will post it on Blackboard for others to review it.

COURSE POLICIES

SU and Newhouse Academic Integrity Policy:

- Syracuse University is committed to compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. This legislation mandates in general that no otherwise qualified individual in the United States shall be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal assistance solely by reason of having a disability. Students with special needs should contact the instructor at the beginning of each semester to discuss any special problems or needs.
- The Newhouse School rules state as follows:
 1. Any piece of work bearing a student's name is assumed by the School to guarantee that the thoughts, expressions, editorial and photographic material not credited to another are literally the student's own. If such credit is not given for another's work the student shall be guilty of committing plagiarism. Plagiarism proceedings will begin when a teacher submits evidence thereof to the Academic Standards Committee of the School.
 2. It is not permissible for any student to submit the same material, with substantially the same style, structure, or wording, to instructors in two or more courses.

The Syracuse University Academic Rules and Regulations state: “Syracuse University students shall exhibit honesty in all academic endeavors. Cheating in any form is not tolerated, nor is assisting another person to cheat. The submission of any work by a student is taken as a guarantee that the thoughts and expressions in it are the student's own, except when properly credited to another. Violations of this principle include giving or receiving aid in an exam or where otherwise prohibited, fraud, plagiarism, the falsification or forgery of any record, or any other deceptive act in connection with academic work. Plagiarism is the representation of another's words, ideas, opinions, or other products of work as one's own, either overtly or by failing to attribute them to their true source. Sanctions for violations will be imposed by the dean, faculty, or student standards committee of the appropriate school or college. Documentation of such academic dishonesty may be included in an appropriate student file at the recommendation of the academic dean.”

- Since Newhouse is a professional school and since you are seeking careers in a professional world, professional attitudes in the classroom are expected. In this professional school, we seek to create a climate of interaction, dialogue, and respect for a diversity of viewpoints and values.

Rule of Conduct:

- Please arrive promptly at the appointed class time, fully prepared to discuss that day's assigned readings. Please turn off cell phones and all electronic devices.
- Our guest lecturers, if any, spend a great deal of time in preparation. Please show them the courtesy of prompt arrival, your attention, and your interest. Feel free to ask lots of questions about their own career development, special problems associated with their organizations, special handling of situations, etc.
- Name tag: Please, bring your name tag to every class until you are informed by the instructor that you don't need it. Especially during guest lecturers' presentations, please bring your name tag.

Attendance Policy:

- It is required, and you are required to be in attendance for the duration of the class. However, since there are some things beyond our control, such as sickness and personal or family emergencies, each student is allowed two absences. The instructor is not in a position to judge the validity of your absences, so I do not distinguish between excused and unexcused absences.

Note: After two absences, the student's final grade will be reduced by 5 points for each absence up to 15 points. And if a student misses more than 10 classes, or 1/3 of the entire classes, the student will be failed.

- If you miss a writing exercise done by students during class time, this in-class exercise, and its points, can never be made up. Absences from class should be supported by evidence from a professional in writing of a family or medical emergency.

Late Assignment Policies:

- Written assignments are due on the assigned date at the beginning of class or at the assigned deadline time. Keep an original copy for yourself, and/or a computer disk.
- There will be absolutely no extensions on the deadline for final projects. The examinations cannot be made up. The only exceptions that can be considered are documented family or medical emergencies. The instructor reserves the right to change the content of the

examination in the case of an approved make-up. Because of the size of this class, the instructor cannot change deadlines and exam dates to accommodate the travel/vacation schedules of individual students. Students are advised to plan their travel schedule with the course schedule and assignment deadlines in mind. Therefore, do not make travel plans that will conflict with the dates on which this course meets or on which assignments are due.

Recommendation Letter Request:

- I am also happy to write letters of recommendation for students whose work and/or credentials I know and support. However, allow at least 10 working days. If you want to me write letters of recommendation for you, please ask me send a form, type the content of the form, and send me electronically.
- I will be available during posted office hours; feel free to stop in. If these times are not convenient, I will be happy to set up a mutually convenient time by appointment.

Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:

- Students who are in need of disability-related academic accommodations must register with the Office of Disability Services (ODS), 804 University Avenue, Room 309, 315-443-4498. Students with authorized disability-related accommodations should provide a current Accommodation Authorization Letter from ODS to the instructor and review those accommodations with the instructor. Accommodations, such as exam administration, are not provided retroactively; therefore, planning for accommodations as early as possible is necessary.

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Note: I will do my best to make MINIMAL changes. However, this syllabus and its accompanying schedule are subject to change to accommodate the pace and special interests of the class and the schedule of guest lecturers. ALL handouts are posted on Blackboard.

INTRODUCTION

WEEK 1

July 2 (WED)

- **Introduction:** Overview of the Course and the Syllabus
- **History:** “A Walk Through the 20th Century with Bill Moyers: The Image Makers”
- **Introductory lecture:** “Defining Public Relations, Public Diplomacy, (& Propaganda)”
- **Readings:**

Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy: Taxonomies and histories. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 31-54.

USIA Alumni Association (2002, September). *What is Public Diplomacy?* Retrieved March 14, 2007, from <http://www.publicdiplomacy.org/1.htm>

USC Center on Public Diplomacy (n.d.). *What is Public Diplomacy?* Retrieved June 2, 2008, from http://uscpublicdiplomacy.com/index.php/about/whatis_pd

Part 1: The links between Public Diplomacy and Public Relations

WEEK 2

July 9 (WED)

- **Seminar topic 1:** “Exploring Links Between Public Diplomacy and Public Relations.”
- **Required readings:**

Gilboa, E. (2008). Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 55-77.

Kruckeberg, D. & Vujnovic, M. (2005). Public relations, not propaganda, for US public diplomacy in a post-9/11 world: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Communication Management*, 9, 296-304.

Signitzer, B., & Wasmer, C. (2006). Public diplomacy: A specific government public relations function. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazelton, (Eds.), *Public relations theory II* (pp. 435-464). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Yun, S.-H., & Toth, E. (in press). Future sociological public diplomacy and the role of public relations: Evolution of public diplomacy. *American Behavioral Scientist*.

- **Recommended readings:**

Grunig, J. E. (1993). Public relations and international affairs: Effects, ethics and responsibility. *Journal of International Affairs*, 47(1), 138-162.

Taylor, M. (2007, working paper). *Toward a relational theory of public diplomacy*. Unpublished paper, Western Michigan University.

Taylor, M. & Kent, M. L. (2006). Nation-building: Public relations theory and practice. In V. Hazelton, & C. H. Botan (Eds.), *Public relations theory II* (pp. 341- 360). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Yun, S. H. (2006). Toward public relations theory-based study of public diplomacy: Testing the applicability of the excellence study. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 18(4), 287-312.

Wolf, C., & Rosen, B. (2004). *Public diplomacy: How to think about and improve it*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp.

- **Book report 1-2: "Overview about Public Diplomacy."**

Leonard, M., Stead C., & Smewing, C. (2002). *Public diplomacy*. London: Foreign Policy Centre.

Richmond, Y. (2008). *Practicing public diplomacy: A cold war odyssey*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.

- **Final case study progress report 1:** Reporting the progress of the introduction part

July 10 (TH): Make-up class for July 4 (FRI)

- **Seminar topic 2: “Public Diplomacy From Perspectives of Country Image, Reputation and Branding.”**

- **Required readings:**

Anholt, S. (2006). Public diplomacy and place branding: Where’s the link? *Place Branding*, 2, 271-275.

Ham, P. (2008). Place branding: The state of the art. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political & Social Science*, 616(1), 126-149.

Yang, S.-U., Shin, H., Lee, J.-H., & Wrigley, B. (in press). Measuring country reputation in multi-dimensions: Predictors, effects, and communication channels. *Journal of Public Relations Research*. [proof version]

- **Recommended readings:**

Anholt, S. (2002). Nation-branding. *Journal of Brand Management*, 9(4-5), 229-239.

Carroll, C. E., & McCombs, M. (2003). Agenda-setting effects of business news on the public’s images and opinions about major corporations. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6(1), 36.

Deephouse, D. (2000). Media reputation as a strategic resource: An integration of mass communication and resource-based theories. *Journal of Management*, 26, 1091~1112.

Falconi, T. M. (2007, February 28). *Enhancing Britain’s global reputation: The perception of country identity in social media*. A presentation to the Management School. Retrieved March 14, 2007, from <http://www.tonisblog.com/?p=153>

Kotler, P., & Gertner, D. (2002). Country as brand, product, and beyond: A place marketing and brand management perspective. *Journal of Brand Management*, 9(4/5), 249-261.

Passow, T., Fehlmann, R., & Grahlow, H. (2005). Country reputation – From measurement to management: The case of Liechtenstein. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 7(4), 309-326.

Papadopoulos, N., & Heslop, L. (2002). Country equity and country branding: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Brand Management*, 9(4/5), 294-314.

Wang, J. (2006). Managing national reputation and international relations in the global era: Public diplomacy revisited. *Public Relations Review*, 32, 91-96.

- **Book report 3-4: “Country Image, Reputation, & Branding.”**

Anholt, S. (2007). *Competitive identity: The new brand management for nations, cities and regions*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin, D. (2007). *Rebuilding brand America*. New York, NY: Amacom.

- **Lecture (if time allows):** “Excellence Theory as a Generic Framework of Global PR” from Grunig, J. E., Grunig, L. A., & Dozier, D. M. (2006). The excellence theory. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazelton, (Eds.), *Public relations theory II* (pp. 21-62). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

July 11 (FRI)

- **Seminar topic 3: “Public Diplomacy & Global/International Public Relations.”**

- **Required readings:**

Dutta-Bergman, M. J. (2006). U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Middle East. *Communication Inquiry*, 30(2), 102-124.

Grunig, J. E. (1993). Public relations and international affairs: Effects, ethics and responsibility. *Journal of International Affairs*, 47(1), 138-162.

Taylor, M. (2000). Cultural variance as a challenge to global public relations: A case study of the Coca-Cola scare in Europe. *Public Relations Review*, 26(3), 277-293.

- **Recommended readings:**

Grunig, J. E., Grunig, L.A., Sriramesh, K., Huang, Y-H., & Lyra, A. (1995). Models of public relations in an international setting. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 7(3), 163-186.

Kennan, W., & Hazleton, V. (2006). International public relations, social capital, and the role of effective organizational communication. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazelton, (Eds.), *Public relations theory II* (pp. 311-340). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Taylor, M., & Kent, M. (2006). Beyond excellence: Extending the generic approach to international public relations: The case of Bosnia. *Public Relations Review*, 33, 10-20.

- **Book report 5-6: “Culture and Globalization.”**

Hofstede G., & Hofstede G. (2004). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Friedman, T. (2007). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Picador.

WEEK 3

July 16 (WED)

- **Exam 1**
- **Seminar topic 4: “Public Diplomacy & Media.”**
- **Required readings:**

Gilboa, E. (2000). Mass communication and diplomacy: A theoretical framework. *Communication Theory*, 10(3), 275-309.

Nisbet, E. C., Nisbet, M. C., Scheufele, D. A., & Shanahan, J. E. (2004) Public diplomacy, television news, and Muslim opinion. *Harvard International Journal of the Press/Politics*. 9(2), 11-37.

Wanta, W., Golan, G., & Lee, C. (2004). AGENDA SETTING AND INTERNATIONAL NEWS: MEDIA INFLUENCE ON PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF FOREIGN NATIONS. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2), 364-377.

Zoch, L., & Molleda, J.-C. (2006). Building a theoretical model of media relations using framing, information subsidies, and agenda building. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazelton, (Eds.), *Public relations theory II* (pp. 279-310). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- **Recommended readings:**

Soroka, S. (2002). Issue Attributes and Agenda-Setting: Media, the Public, and Policymakers in Canada. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 14(3), 264-285.

Wang, J. (2007), & Chang, T.-K. (2004). Strategic public diplomacy and local press: How a high-profile “head-of-state” visit was covered in America’s heartland. *Public Relations Review*, 30, 11-24.

Wang, X., Zhang, D., & Northup, T. (2007). *What shapes Americans’ opinions about other countries? News, entertainment, and personal experience*. Unpublished paper, Syracuse University.

Part 2: Toward Further Understanding of Public Diplomacy

July 17 (TH): Make-up class for August 6

- **Book report 7-9: “Public Diplomacy & Media.”**

Entman, R. M. (2004). *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and US Foreign Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Required book]

Hess S. (2005). *Through Their Eyes: Foreign Correspondents in the United States*. Brookings Institution Press.

Rushing, J. (2007). *Mission Al Jazeera: Build a bridge, seek the truth, change the world*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- **Seminar topic 5: “American Power, War (on Terrorism) and Public Diplomacy.”**

- **Required readings:**

Horowitz, I. L. (2006, Spring). The struggle for democracy. *The National Interest*, 114-120.

Kennedy, L., Lucas, S. (2005). Enduring freedom: Public diplomacy and U.S. foreign policy. *American Quarterly*, 57(2), 309-333.

Lafeber, W. (2007). Some perspectives in U.S. foreign relations. *Diplomatic History*, 31, 423-426.

Kopstein, J. (2006, Spring). The transatlantic divide over democracy promotion. *The Washington Quarterly*, 85.98. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from http://www.twq.com/06spring/docs/06spring_kopstein.pdf

Peterson, P. G. (2002). Public diplomacy and the war on terrorism. *Foreign Affairs*, 81(5), 74.

- **Recommended readings:**

Robin, R. (2005). Requiem for public diplomacy? *American Quarterly*, 57(2), 345-353.

Von Eschen, P. M. (2005). Enduring public diplomacy. *American Quarterly*, 57(2), 335-343.

The White House (2006, March 16). *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2006/nss2006.pdf>

- **Book report 10-11: “Power and American Public Diplomacy.”**

Fukuyama, F. (2006). *America at the crossroads: Democracy, power and the neo-conservative legacy*. Yale University Press.

Snow, N. (2006). *The arrogance of American power: What U.S. leaders are doing wrong and why it's our duty to dissent*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

July 18 (FRI)

- **Any book report to be done?**
- **Final Case Study Progress Report 2:** Reporting the progress of the literature review part.

WEEK 4

July 23 (WED)

- **Book report 12-13: “Power and American Public Diplomacy.”**

Lord, C. (2006). *Losing hearts and minds?: Public diplomacy and strategic influence in the age of terror*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.

Nye, J. S. (2003). *The Paradox of American power: Why the world's only superpower can't go it alone*. Oxford University Press.

- **Seminar topic 6: “Cultural Diplomacy.”**

- **Required Readings:**

Schneider, C. (2003). *Diplomacy that works: Best practices in cultural diplomacy*. Center for Arts and Culture, Cultural Diplomacy Research Series.

Snow, N. (2008). International Exchanges and the U.S. Image. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 198-222.

Feigenbaum, H. B. (2002) *Globalization and cultural diplomacy*. Center for Arts and Culture, Art, Culture, and National Agenda Issue Paper.

- **Recommended readings:**

Report of the Advisory Committee on Cultural Diplomacy. (2005, September). *Cultural Diplomacy: The Linchpin of Public Diplomacy*. U.S. Department of State.

Dandavate, R. (2007, May 7). Building cultural understanding through cultural exchange. Unpublished paper.

- **Book report 14-15: “Cultural Diplomacy.”**

Arndt, R. (2005). *The first resort of kings: American cultural diplomacy in the twentieth century*. Dulles, VA: Potomac Books.

Cooper, A. F. (2007). *Celebrity diplomacy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

July 24 (TH): Make-up class for August 8

- **Seminar topic 7: “A New Direction of Diplomacy: Soft Power as Public Diplomacy.”**

- **Required readings:**

Nye, J. S., Jr. (2008). Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 94-109.

Wang, Y. (2008). Public Diplomacy and the Rise of Chinese Soft Power. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 257-273.

Wilson, E. J., III. (2008). Hard Power, Soft Power, Smart Power. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 110-124.

- **Recommended readings:**

Melissen, J. (2005, May). Wielding soft power: The new public diplomacy. Netherlands Institute of International Relations *Clingendael*.

Noya, J. (2005). The symbolic power of nations. *Place Branding*, 2(1), 53-67.

Nye, J. S. (2006, October 27). Soft power, hard power and leadership. Retrieved June 4, 2007, from http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/netgov/files/talks/docs/11_06_06_seminar_Nye_HP_SP_Leadership.pdf

- **Book report 16-17: “Soft Power in Public Diplomacy.”**

Nye, J. S. (2005). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs. [Required book]

Melissen, J. (2005). *The new public diplomacy: Soft power in international relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- **Book report 18-19: “NGO, Global Civil Society and Net Diplomacy.”**

Weimann, G. (2006). *Terror on the Internet: The New Arena, The New Challenges*. NW, Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.

Warkentin, C. (2001). *Reshaping world politics: NGOs, the Internet, and global civil society*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

July 25 (FRI)

- **2nd exam**
- **Any book report to be done?**
- **Final Case Study Progress Report 3:** Reporting the progress of the case analysis part

WEEK 5

July 30 (WED)

- **Class evaluation**
- **Presentations of Final Case Studies 1**

August 1 (FRI): Last Day of Class

- **Presentations of Final Case Studies 2**

RECOMMENDED READINGS FOR OTHER TOPICS

The Growth of National/Transnational Civil Society:

Anheier, H., Glasius, M., & Kaldor, M (Eds.) (2005). *Global civil society yearbook*. London: Sage Publications.

Castells, M. (2008). The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political*

and Social Science, 616(1), 78-93.

International Broadcasting:

Dizard, W. P. Jr. (2004). *Inventing public diplomacy: The story of the U.S. information agency*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner.

Heil, A. Jr. (2003). *Voice of America*. New York: Columbia University Press.

El-Nawawy, M., & Adel, I. (2003). *Al-Jazeera: The story of the network that is rattling governments and redefining modern journalism*. Cambridge, MA: Westview Press.

Historical Perspective:

Creel, G. (1920). *How we advertised America: The first telling of the amazing story of the committee on public information that carried the gospel of Americanism to every corner of the globe*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Taylor, P. (1996). *Munitions of the mind: War propaganda from the ancient world to the nuclear age*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Price, M. (2002). *Media and sovereignty: The global information revolution and its challenge to state power*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Snyder, A. A. (1995). *Warriors of disinformation: How Charles Wick, the USIA, and videotape won the cold war*. New York, NY: Arcade Publishing.

Schulman, H. C. (1990). *The voice of America: Propaganda and democracy, 1941-1945*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Appendix A: Seminar Discussion Group

<i>Student name</i>	<i>Seminar</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Seminar Topic</i>
Nichole Allem	4	7/16	Public Diplomacy & Media
Luciana Amodeo	4	7/16	Public Diplomacy & Media
Katherine Avgerinos	4	7/16	Public Diplomacy & Media
Caitlin Cetola	5	7/17	American Power, War (on Terrorism) and Public Diplomacy
Soumitra Chatterjee	5	7/17	American Power, War (on Terrorism) and Public Diplomacy
Jacqueline Cho	5	7/17	American Power, War (on Terrorism) and Public Diplomacy
Roko Devkota Chhetri	7	7/24	A New Direction of Diplomacy: "Soft Power" as Public Diplomacy
Felipe Estefan	7	7/24	A New Direction of Diplomacy: "Soft Power" as Public Diplomacy
Kristin Ghazarians	6	7/23	Cultural Diplomacy
Sarah Goldfarb	6	7/23	Cultural Diplomacy
Lauren Hart	3	7/11*	Public Diplomacy & Global/International Public Relations
Brittany Jackson	3	7/11*	Public Diplomacy & Global/International Public Relations
Ahout Nina Koffi	2	7/10*	Public Diplomacy From Perspectives of Country Image, Reputation and Branding
(Daniel McSwain)	3	7/11*	Public Diplomacy & Global/International Public Relations
Brendan Rohr	2	7/10*	Public Diplomacy From Perspectives of Country Image, Reputation and Branding
Kimberly Rouse	2	7/10*	Public Diplomacy From Perspectives of Country Image, Reputation and Branding
Siobhan Sheils	1	7/9*	Exploring Links Between Public Diplomacy and Public Relations
Sarabeth Smith	1	7/9*	Exploring Links Between Public Diplomacy and Public Relations
Biou Wang	1	7/9*	Exploring Links Between Public Diplomacy and Public Relations

Note: *These students are highly recommended to start reading class readings from Blackboard as soon as possible.

Appendix B: Book Report

Student name	#	Date	Book Title
Nichole Allem	1	7/9*	Leonard, M., Stead C., & Smewing, C. (2002). <i>Public diplomacy</i> . London: Foreign Policy Centre.
Luciana Amodeo	2	7/9*	Richmond, Y. (2008). <i>Practicing public diplomacy: A cold war odyssey</i> . Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.
Katherine Avgerinos	3	7/10*	Anholt, S. (2007). <i>Competitive identity: The new brand management for nations, cities and regions</i> . Palgrave Macmillan.
Caitlin Cetola	4	7/10*	Martin, D. (2007). <i>Rebuilding brand America</i> . New York, NY: Amacom.
Soumitra Chatterjee	5	7/11*	Hofstede G., & Hofstede G. (2004). <i>Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind</i> . New York: McGraw-Hill.
Jacqueline Cho	6	7/11*	Friedman, T. (2007). <i>The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century</i> . New York, NY: Picador.
Roko Devkota Chhetri	7	7/17	Entman, R. M. (2004). <i>Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and US Foreign Policy</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Felipe Estefan	8	7/17	Hess S. (2005). <i>Through Their Eyes: Foreign Correspondents in the United States</i> . Brookings Institution Press.
Kristin Ghazarians	9	7/17	Rushing, J. (2007). <i>Mission Al Jazeera: Build a bridge, seek the truth, change the world</i> . New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
Sarah Goldfarb	10	7/17	Fukuyama, F. (2006). <i>America at the crossroads: Democracy, power and the neo-conservative legacy</i> . Yale University Press.
Lauren Hart	11	7/17	Snow, N. (2006). <i>The arrogance of American power: What U.S. leaders are doing wrong and why it's our duty to dissent</i> . Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Brittany Jackson	12	7/23	Lord, C. (2006). <i>Losing hearts and minds?: Public diplomacy and strategic influence in the age of terror</i> . Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.
Ahout Nina Koffi	13	7/23	Nye, J. S. (2003). <i>The Paradox of American power: Why the world's only superpower can't go it alone</i> . Oxford University Press.
(Daniel McSwain)	14	7/23	Arndt, R. (2005). <i>The first resort of kings: American cultural diplomacy in the twentieth century</i> . Dulles, VA: Potomac Books.
Brendan Rohr	15	7/23	Cooper, A. F. (2007). <i>Celebrity diplomacy</i> . Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
Kimberly Rouse	16	7/24	Nye, J. S. (2005). <i>Soft power: The means to success in world politics</i> . New York: Public Affairs. [Required book]
Siobhan Sheils	17	7/24	Melissen, J. (2005). <i>The new public diplomacy: Soft power in international relations</i> . New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Sarabeth Smith	18	7/24	Weimann, G. (2006). <i>Terror on the Internet: The New Arena, The New Challenges</i> . NW, Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.
Biou Wang	19	7/24	Warkentin, C. (2001). <i>Reshaping world politics: NGOs, the Internet, and global civil society</i> . Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Note: *These students are highly recommended to get the books and start reading them as soon as possible.