UDC 327.82:327.8:341.7
DOI https://doi.org/10.32782/2707-5206.2026.42.17

Tarasiuk Yu. M.
Associate Professor,
Department of the Social Sciencss and Regional Studies,
Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University,
r. 37, Frantsuzkyi blv., 24/26, Odesa, 65058, Ukraine
E-mail: tarasiuk_yuliia@onu.edu.ua
ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-7237-4971

THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY: THEORETICAL APPROACHES, TYPOLOGY, AND EVOLUTION

In recent years, against the backdrop of globalization and the rapid development of information and communication technologies, citizens' ability to influence their governments' policies has increased significantly. In this regard, governments seeking to maintain and expand their influence globally are endeavoring to adapt to these new trends in the planning and implementation of their foreign policy. In this article, the author conducts a theoretical analysis of public diplomacy and its evolution through the lens of the fundamental principles of the liberal and realist paradigms. The analysis of academic works is presented chronologically, from the introduction of the term 'public diplomacy' into political science discourse by E. Galion to its contemporary constructive re-examination by M. Leonard, S. Anholt and N. Cull. The stages of the term's transformation, along with changes to the scope and framework of the updated doctrine of public diplomacy, are outlined, taking into account the influence of historical events and the corresponding system of international relations. Particular attention is paid to the study of George Tion's concepts of 'soft, hard and smart power' and examples of their application by countries in their political activities on the international stage. Based on the results of a study of sources and historiography on this specific subject, the author provides an appropriate definition of the term 'public diplomacy' as a tool and a strand of foreign policy, implemented within the framework of activities by state and non-state political institutions and actors to carry out a comprehensive diplomatic strategy, aimed at influencing the population of a foreign state in order to shape its political processes and decision-making. In the conclusion, the author raises the question of whether governments and societies around the world need to study the practical implementation of the basic principles of public diplomacy. The study includes examples of public diplomacy from countries around the world (the USA, Turkey, and Ukraine) as case studies and illustrations of the theoretical material. However, the author believes that implementing public diplomacy and evaluating the effectiveness of developing new 'soft power' tools are areas that require further research. This is based on a new approach to the study of a specific state's public diplomacy – through the 'subject-object' lens. In the author's view, this approach will enable public diplomacy to fulfill its role in foreign policy strategy and to assess the influence of a country's foreign public diplomacy on domestic political processes.

Key words: public diplomacy, foreign policy, concept, soft power, smart power.

© Tarasiuk Yu. M., 2026

Стаття поширюється
на умовах ліцензії
відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)

Formulation of the problem in general form, its relation to scientific or practical problems. Public diplomacy today is an important part of the foreign policy activities of any state worldwide. In implementing it, governments draw on the theoretical foundations of liberal and realist concepts of power and strength, and adopt the experience of the world's leading diplomatic services. The current era of globalization, multipolarity, and the transformation of the system of international relations, while also seeing the growing role of national interests and the factor of power, requires states to adopt new approaches. These include means of communication with foreign societies, web diplomacy, transit and nation-branding, and technologies for influencing decision-making in the post-truth era. An analysis of the theoretical concept of public diplomacy, its evolution and the fundamental principles of the liberal and realist paradigms appears essential for understanding and shaping a country's foreign policy strategy. The growing role of public diplomacy in political processes and the widespread application of its techniques in the political sphere lend this research practical relevance.

Analysis of recent research and publications, methodological basis of the study. Many foreign authors have focused on public diplomacy and its application in political processes; in recent years, Ukrainian scholars have also begun to actively research public diplomacy, using Ukraine as a case study. Nevertheless, there is as yet no comprehensive theoretical study on this subject in Ukraine. This research was based on an analysis of sources, historiography, and documents on the subject from authors such as J. Nye, N. Call, M. Leonard, E. Gilboa, T. Syvak, M. Castells, E. Carr, and others, who have examined the administrative, philosophical, communicative, and political aspects of public diplomacy.

The theoretical foundations for elucidating the essence of the term 'public diplomacy' are provided by theorists in political science and international relations. The first academic definition of the term 'public diplomacy' was provided by E. Gallion: 'public diplomacy is part of the influence of public relations on the formulation and conduct of foreign policy. These activities encompass those aspects of international relations that lie beyond the scope of traditional diplomacy: the shaping by the government of one country of public opinion in another country; the interaction of private groups and their interests in one state with similar groups and interests in another; official data on international relations and their impact on policy; and communication between those engaged in public diplomacy. "The key element in public diplomacy is the transnational flow of ideas" (United States Information Agency Alumni Association, 2002, p. 6).

The article's second research direction concerns the evolution of the public diplomacy concept. E. Gallion originally introduced the term 'public diplomacy' as a synonym for the English word 'propaganda' to give it a neutral connotation. However, beyond this definition, other interpretations do not fundamentally alter the concept. For example, the American diplomat G. Touch defines public diplomacy as "the process of government communication with a foreign audience, the aim of which is to ensure that the foreign public understands the nation's ideas and ideals, has an understanding of the country's institutions and culture, as well as its national objectives in contemporary politics" (Tuch, 1990). F. Taylor, a British professor at the University of Leeds, regards public diplomacy as "actions aimed at fostering long-term relations, safeguarding a country's foreign policy objectives, and promoting a

better understanding of the values and institutions of one's own state abroad" (Snow & Taylor, 2009).

In the course of his academic research, N. Call discovered that the concept of "public diplomacy" had been used previously, for example, in an 1856 article in the London Times (Cull, 2007). The authors of the article introduced the term to define "honest diplomacy," and just a few years later, journalists at The New York Times used it to mean "open, non-secret diplomacy" (Cull, 2008).

Public diplomacy was also studied by other researchers of the time. For example, in 1968, the American scholar A. Hoffman, in his book "International Communications and the New Diplomacy", argued that "the revolution in mass media has given rise to a new form of diplomacy, the methods of which have not yet been fully explored. He believed that state policy should be comprehensible not to foreign diplomats, but to the public, whose collective influence shapes the policy of their own Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Hoffman, 1968).

The third direction addresses the typology of public diplomacy, the role of media diplomacy. This research direction concerns media diplomacy and the relationship between diplomacy, international communication, and media systems. The article "Media Diplomacy: Conceptual Divergence and Applications" distinguishes media diplomacy from public diplomacy and media-broker diplomacy (Gilboa, 1998). The subsequent work, "Diplomacy in the Media Age: Three Models of Uses and Effects," further develops the distinction between these models (Gilboa, 2001). These studies are important for clarifying the conceptual boundaries between communication directed at foreign publics and diplomatic interaction conducted through or involving the media. Cultural diplomacy and its relationship with national interests, international cultural relations, and public engagement. In Cultural Diplomacy: Beyond the National Interest?, the authors critically examine approaches that define cultural diplomacy primarily in terms of the pursuit of state interests (Ang, Isar & Mar, 2015). Their analysis provides a basis for considering cultural diplomacy as a field in which governmental objectives, cultural actors, diaspora activities, and broader international cultural relations may intersect.

Public Diplomacy in the Digital Age examines the implications of digital technologies for public diplomacy. This work is relevant to understanding how digital platforms have transformed communication practices, how diplomatic institutions interact with foreign audiences, and the conditions under which public diplomacy is conducted (Bjola, Cassidy & Manor, 2019).

Selection of previously unresolved parts of the problem. Despite the growing academic interest in public diplomacy, its conceptual boundaries, typological diversity, and transformation under the influence of globalization and digital communication remain insufficiently systematized. Particular attention requires clarifying the relationship between public diplomacy and the concepts of soft, hard, and smart power, as well as distinguishing the roles of state and non-state actors in shaping foreign public opinion. An additional unresolved issue concerns the assessment of public diplomacy's effectiveness and its potential impact on domestic political processes in target countries. The article addresses these gaps through a comparative analysis of theoretical approaches, the historical evolution of the concept, and the contemporary forms of public, cultural, and media diplomacy.

Formulation of the goals of the article, presentation of the main research material with full substantiation of scientific results. The aim of the article is to

provide a detailed analysis of the theoretical aspects of the concept of 'public diplomacy' and its evolution in the second half of the 20th and early 21st centuries, from the theoretical concept to the role of public diplomacy as part of states' foreign policy, and to illustrate its transformation to the cultural and media diplomacy prospects.

The methodological basis of the research. The research's methodological basis combines general scientific methods with specialized methods used in political science and international relations. The historical method traces the evolution of public diplomacy, from its emergence in academic discourse to its contemporary interpretation, in light of changes in the international system and the development of media diplomacy technologies. Conceptual analysis examines the principal definitions of public diplomacy and distinguishes it from related concepts, including propaganda and its use as a soft-power tool.

A comparative analysis identifies similarities and differences between liberal and realist approaches to power and examines their implications for understanding public diplomacy as a foreign policy instrument. Particular attention is given to Joseph Nye's concepts of soft power, hard power, and smart power, and to their relationship with the realist understanding of political power presented in E. H. Carr's works. This systematic approach treats public diplomacy as a multidimensional phenomenon at the intersection of foreign policy, international communication, cultural relations, and interactions between state and non-state actors.

The study also uses chronological analysis to trace changes in how public diplomacy has been interpreted theoretically and applied in practice across historical periods. Qualitative analysis of academic literature, scholarly publications, and relevant documentary sources helps identify the main stages in the concept's development and the factors behind its transformation. In addition, a comparative case-study approach examines the experiences of the United States, Turkey, and Ukraine, showing how public diplomacy features in national foreign policy strategies across different political and historical contexts. These cases are illustrative, not the basis for a comprehensive empirical assessment of the effectiveness of national public diplomacy policies.

Finally, the subject-object approach serves as an analytical lens for examining public diplomacy, drawing on existing scholarship in public diplomacy and international relations theory. In particular, the relationship between subject-centered and object-centered perspectives in international relations theory has been examined (Allan, 2018). Building on this contribution, the present study applies the subject-object perspective to analyze the interaction between actors implementing public diplomacy and foreign audiences that receive, interpret, and respond to diplomatic initiatives. Particular attention is paid to the potential influence of external public diplomacy on public opinion and domestic political processes in target countries. This analytical perspective provides a conceptual basis for further research into the reciprocal nature of public diplomacy and the relationship between its intended objectives and its potential political effects.

The concept of public diplomacy: theoretical approaches

At an official level, the term 'public diplomacy' was first used in 1977 at a session of the US Congress, in a report by the Murphy Commission on the organization of the foreign policy apparatus.

Public diplomacy, as an instrument of countries' foreign policy, has been employed in various forms for several centuries. Nevertheless, the concept was not formally

defined until the mid-20th century, thanks to E. Gallion. The nuclear factor made it impossible to rely solely on force in international affairs and in countries' foreign policies during the second half of the 20th century. This is precisely why states had to seek new methods of pursuing their national interests.

From the start of the Cold War, methods of public diplomacy were perceived as propaganda. The term 'cultural imperialism' was even introduced into political and academic discourse. The concept of cultural imperialism describes how cultural influence can achieve political objectives in other countries through mass media, music, the arts, and education (Christopher, 2002). For example, G. Schiller and W. Reed argued that cultural imperialism could not constitute a policy in its own right, but was merely cultural expansion.

Interest in public diplomacy intensified during a period of radical change in the system of international relations and global politics, namely the end of the Cold War and the emergence of a multipolar world. The political climate called for new approaches, which led to the emergence and development of new concepts. Harvard University professor J. Nye proposed a new approach to understanding public diplomacy in 1990 through the term 'soft power'. The scholar proposed that this concept be understood as a means by which one state exerts influence over others through persuasion and the creation of an attractive image, rather than through the instruments of 'hard power' (Nye, 1990).

'Soft power' can be characterized by three main components: culture, values and foreign policy. 'Soft power' operates through cooperation between interested parties based on shared views and values. From J. Nye's perspective, this yields more long-lasting results through the loyalty of foreign societies and the potential influence on the adoption of necessary political decisions.

'Soft power' exists at the level of interaction between societies, rather than between state bodies. J. Nye viewed public diplomacy as an effective tool for building 'soft power', rather than as a separate concept of foreign policy. In his view, it was divided into three parts: direct communication of foreign policy actions, the development of direct contacts with foreign audiences, and the focus on the most important political issues. This aspect can be explained in more detail by describing these dimensions of public diplomacy in practice as follows.

Firstly, the daily coverage of domestic and foreign policy and the explanation to the public of government decisions. The second dimension is 'strategic communication', which involves the targeted discussion of political issues of the greatest importance to the state. Thirdly, the development of direct contacts with the foreign public through exchange programs, scholarships and academic conferences, which enable foreign citizens to familiarise themselves with the country's culture and way of life (Nye, 2003). Thus, J. Nye's research explained how public diplomacy should operate in the new context of the international system's transformation and the geopolitical balance of power.

At the same time, the scholar emphasized that this dimension alone cannot serve as a foreign policy instrument without state foreign policy bodies, since only the country's leadership can define its strategic interests abroad and ensure the implementation of political decisions. In 2004, J. Nye presented a detailed study of 'soft power' in his monograph: «Soft Power: How to Succeed in World Politics». In his view, whilst "hard power" involves the use of various instruments of coercion – such as

economic sanctions, the threat of military action, or deterrence – to achieve objectives, "soft power" is based on three other elements. First and foremost, this refers to a culture capable of arousing interest among the general public, attractive political values (both domestically and internationally), and a legitimate foreign policy (the actions of that state must possess moral authority amongst other states). In other words, the use of 'soft power' enables a state to 'create a favorable international environment in which the state – as the bearer of this power – can pursue its own interests without resorting to direct, hard power or threats' (Nye, 2004).

The idea that a state can achieve its foreign policy objectives without the widespread use of traditional, hard methods of influence – which, among other things, provoke sharp condemnation from the international community – has quite rightly attracted renewed attention from academics and politicians. In this context, there has been a natural interest in analyzing the instruments that enable a state to enhance its 'soft power'. Researchers identify two approaches to building 'soft power': the 'natural' and the 'artificial'. The natural approach involves pursuing foreign and domestic policies that, in and of themselves, elicit approval and sympathy from the international community: this may include improving the quality of life for the country's citizens, establishing a promising economic model, and actively participating in resolving global challenges. In this case, the state's standing on the world stage steadily rises, and its value system and activities begin to be perceived as a successful model, the adoption and adaptation of which does not cause dissatisfaction amongst other participants in international relations. The 'artificial' approach to building 'soft power' involves the targeted implementation of measures to inform foreign audiences: providing detailed explanations of the country's policies, actively promoting its cultural values, monitoring and responding to negative assessments, and conducting activities to expand its informational influence abroad.

Evolution of the public diplomacy concept

Consequently, the 'artificial' approach, unlike the 'natural' one, is more proactive and enables the state to control the process of building 'soft power', making it a deliberate process aimed at achieving specific goals. This is precisely why many researchers refer to public diplomacy as a key instrument of 'soft power'.

It can be concluded that since the emergence of the term 'public diplomacy '- which has been analyzed in detail above -'public diplomacy' has undergone a significant evolution. It has moved from being a synonym for 'propaganda' to becoming a distinct branch of foreign policy and state activity, complete with a range of tools for its implementation.

Although the concepts of 'soft power' and public diplomacy have become widespread in Western academic literature, they were not widely recognized for a long time. The development of academic research on public diplomacy in the 1990s remained largely theoretical. In fact, many countries significantly reduced their expenditure on relevant programs during the 1990s. One exception was the implementation of the Republic of Turkey's foreign policy strategy towards the Eurasian countries, specifically the former Turkic republics of the Soviet Union. Officially, the theoretical foundations for the policy of rapprochement and engagement with the region's newly independent states were political concepts such as 'Pan-Turkism' and 'Pan-Osmanism'. It was these concepts that formed the basis of the Republic of Turkey's foreign policy doctrines

during that period, but they were put into practice through the instruments of public diplomacy and 'soft power'.

Practical interest in this sphere arose following the terrorist attack on 11 September 2002. Given the evident limitations of operating in a 'unilateral' mode, the main focus of new research became the search for means of two-way communication and the assessment of the reciprocal impact on the target audience of public diplomacy.

The terrorist attacks of 2001 demonstrated that non-state actors can pose a significant threat even to the most powerful modern states, and in this context, a positive attitude among foreign audiences is important regardless of inter-state relations.

The intensification of public diplomacy in the new millennium was accompanied by the dynamic development of its theoretical foundations. Within the framework of international relations theory, public diplomacy is viewed through the prism of soft power. This is because an effective system of communication with foreign audiences enhances states' ability to influence their preferences and, to some extent, shapes their actions. In addition to the theory of international relations, contemporary public diplomacy has been significantly influenced by marketing techniques and approaches to state branding, as well as the broader development of research in international communication. The combination of marketing techniques and the concept of soft power, along with the application of military expertise in psychological operations, underpinned the sharp intensification of US public diplomacy immediately following 11 September 2001.

When discussing the nature of public diplomacy, it is worth referring to the work of the British scholar Mark Leonard, «Public Diplomacy». The author identifies three aspects of public diplomacy: reactive, proactive and relationship-building (Leonard, 2002).

The reactive aspect involves assessing the extent and nature of responses to past events, as well as providing explanations and commentary. The proactive aspect involves actions aimed at shaping public opinion by transmitting specific messages and signals. In this context, particular attention is paid to developing a long-term strategy that identifies the most important objectives and plans appropriate measures to achieve them. Finally, relationship-building aims to find mutually acceptable solutions and compromises that benefit all parties involved. For example, this involves engaging foreign audiences in dialogue and establishing close ties that would form the basis for shaping public opinion in a given country (such as training young professionals from other countries, exchange programs, and cultural and language centers). Continuing his argument, Leonard believes that, by its very nature, public diplomacy can be competitive (aimed at improving one's own image, most often by discrediting an opponent) or cooperative (aimed at developing mutually beneficial relations). An important aspect of successful public diplomacy is the preparation and adaptation of information intended for a foreign audience. It is always necessary to bear in mind that information passes through the recipient country's so-called 'cultural filter' and may have the opposite effect.

In 2007, J. Nye proposed the concept of 'smart power', which combines the methods of 'soft power' and 'hard power' (military and economic). One example of the application of 'smart power' is the fight against terrorism (Nye & Armitage,

2007, p. 6). Nye argues that the US was a 'smart power' during the Cold War and successfully maintained a balance between hard and soft power, implementing an integrated strategy. In this sense, the concept of power is close to realist theory, as it measures a country's strength in international relations in terms of material and military capabilities. It is precisely for this reason that J. Nye's liberal concept has attracted some criticism from scholars of international relations theory. There is a similarity between J. Nye's approach to power and that of E. Carr – a prominent classical realist in international relations theory. E. Carr divides political power into three categories: military power, economic power and power over opinion (Carr, 1946). According to him, states use these to ensure national security and protect national interests. Power lies at the heart of realist theory; E. Carr believes that intangible concepts, such as personality psychology or public opinion, are also important. "The art of persuasion has always been an important trait of a political leader. The modern approach, which regards propaganda as a new weapon, is essentially correct."

Moreover, 'smart power' – defined as a combination of hard and soft power – also aligns with E. Carr's approach to power, as he believes that, in addition to economic and military resources, intangible sources of power are also important (Carr, 1946).

Typology of public diplomacy, the role of media diplomacy.

In recent years, political scientists have introduced the concept of 'new public diplomacy'. The need to rethink public diplomacy was prompted by changes in the modern world, including the development of information technology, the acceleration of globalization, and, as a consequence, the blurring of boundaries between the spheres of responsibility of state and non-state actors. Moreover, the failures of US public diplomacy following the events of 11 September 2001 revealed the limitations of traditional methods of international communication. A. Dolinsky notes that communication aimed at replacing one set of perceptions with another does not always prove effective; this is precisely why researchers and practitioners of public diplomacy "have recognized the need to employ not only the paradigm of rivalry but also the paradigm of cooperation in public diplomacy".

In his work «New Public Diplomacy», J. Melissen, a senior research fellow at the Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Klingen Dael), defines public diplomacy as "the process of promoting interests and disseminating values in another country by establishing direct contacts with its population" (Melissen, 2005).

Crocker Snow-Mol, Director of the Edward Murrow Center, offers a more specific definition of this phenomenon: "the concept of 'public diplomacy', which traditionally referred to government activities aimed at influencing foreign audiences, has now expanded significantly and gone beyond the scope of government regulation alone; and now involves the media, transnational corporations, non-governmental organizations and other active participants in international relations". Public diplomacy and national branding should, as before, be regarded as instruments of soft power. However, the definition and application of public diplomacy have changed amid the expansion and diversification of actors and control, shifting from the state to the individual level. Thus, 'new public diplomacy', according to the concept's authors, does not envisage a leading role for the state in implementing this policy; rather, it includes the activities of non-state actors. In this regard, N. The call suggests that new public diplomacy is more characteristic of democratic countries, where trust in state structures is often

lower than in non-state institutions and organizations; consequently, non-state actors can play a more significant and active role in implementing this policy.

Comparing new and traditional public diplomacy, N. Call notes, for example, that new public diplomacy aims not merely to improve a country's image but to create a brand; interaction with the audience occurs not only vertically (state–public) but also horizontally (for example, community–public). The main objective is not only to convey information to the recipient but also to build relationships through dialogue and related interactions. Consequently, in countries with strict state regulation, where the state still plays the leading role in policymaking, the techniques and methods of traditional public diplomacy are characteristic.

According to M. Castells, public diplomacy should not be a method of conducting state foreign policy; rather, it is needed to create channels of communication between different societies and cultures. In his works, M. Castells argues that public diplomacy should not be aimed at gaining and maintaining political influence, but rather at creating the conditions for general dialogue and joint development. The scholar's central thesis is that public diplomacy is a tool for finding common solutions and developing a unified approach. He believed that in the modern world, key foreign policy decisions cannot be made without consultation with other participants in international relations, and that public diplomacy must create the conditions for open and comprehensive dialogue that take into account the interests of all parties. Modern internet technologies have laid the foundations for such dialogue. The possibilities for real-time global communication have significantly complicated state control over international communications. These new means of communication, which have brought about fundamental changes in the structure of international relations, have attracted considerable interest among scholars assessing the role of public diplomacy in today's world of global internet communication and the transformation of that communication into media diplomacy (Castells, 2008).

E. Gilboa, Director of the Center for International Relations at Bar-Ilan University, also highlights the distinctive features of this new form of public diplomacy. These include the active use of new technologies and the internet, which open up numerous opportunities for engagement with foreign audiences (Gilboa, 2008).

Media diplomacy is a component of public diplomacy – a system of communication strategies aimed at shaping a positive international image of the state, informing foreign audiences, and engaging them to support the country's foreign policy.

In this context, media diplomacy is understood as the use of media and digital platforms to promote national interests, influence public opinion abroad, and uphold the state's international image. As Gilboa (Gilboa, 2005) notes, the media fulfill three key functions in diplomacy: 1) they serve as an instrument of public diplomacy, 2) they convey signals to other international actors, 3) they are a source of information on global events.

Researcher Lim (Lim, 2017) supplements the conceptual analysis with a model of media processes in diplomacy. In particular, he highlights the hierarchical nature of the media in the coverage of international events, where leading global media outlets set the framework for discourse; a model of media flows, where information circulates between global and local media environments; and the concept of the 'four diplomacies', which combines public, traditional, non-state and media diplomacy within a single process.

Media diplomacy is implemented through a wide range of communication tools: organizing press conferences, publishing interviews with officials, participating in talk shows, launching international media campaigns, leaking specific information to the media, and engaging on social media.

An example of this phenomenon is Twitter diplomacy – the practice of using the social media platform X (Twitter) by government bodies, foreign ministers and diplomatic missions to officially inform a global audience. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine became one of the pioneers in the use of this form of diplomacy, particularly during Russia's armed aggression in 2022, actively commenting on events, calling for support for Ukraine and mobilizing the international community via digital platforms. Another important tool is cultural diplomacy, which is inextricably linked to media diplomacy through the production and export of cultural

content. For example, the global distribution of Turkish television series not only expands the audience for Turkish culture but also serves as soft power to advance Ankara's foreign policy agenda. According to the Global Soft Power Index (2024), cultural output has significantly strengthened Turkey's soft power, securing its place among the world's top 30 countries in terms of cultural influence. High-profile media events, such as international conferences, summits, and visits by heads of state, play a distinct role: they are actively covered by the media and serve as platforms for image diplomacy. Through a well-structured information campaign, the state can convey the desired messages and demonstrate its readiness to cooperate or address specific challenges. In this context, the media become not merely a channel, but a co-creator of the diplomatic process.

The United States of America, China, and the Turkish Republic are leaders in using the internet to achieve political objectives. This strand of a country's media diplomacy goes by various names (digital diplomacy, cyber-diplomacy, public diplomacy, Web 2.0 diplomacy). It can be broadly characterized as: "exerting influence on a foreign audience by broadcasting radio and television programs online and monitoring discussions on social media".

Examples of public media and digital diplomacy show that American newspapers, radio, and television stations, such as Radio Sawa, Al Hurray, and the Voice of America, have played a decisive role in conveying US values to the Middle East (Nisbet, Nisbet, Scheufele & Shanahan, 2004). Similarly, Turkey uses the media. The Anadolu News Agency (AA) and TRT, state-run organizations, have begun broadcasting in Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian from their Sarajevo office and in Arabic from their Cairo office (Yeşil, 2015). TRT has also launched an Arabic-language channel, which is expected to reach almost half of the world's population in the Middle East, while TRT World broadcasts in English and more than 40 other languages. In addition to these initiatives, in 2009 Turkey established the Yunus Emre Institute – the equivalent of the British Council, which has opened so far in 69 countries and has 93 institutions (Kalin, 2011).

Research findings and prospects for further research in this area. A review of studies on public diplomacy indicates the continuous and dynamic development of this concept. Theoretical perspectives on the development of public diplomacy have changed significantly over time, evolving from the study and analysis of cultural exchanges and propaganda work to the creation of interdisciplinary concepts that bring together the objectives and interests of political science, marketing, sociology

and IT. In practical terms, public diplomacy cannot replace existing formats of international cooperation, but the effective application of its tools provides governments with additional opportunities to achieve necessary political objectives.

In conclusion, it can be said that further academic research into public diplomacy should be conducted within the 'subject–object' framework. In today's world, it is impossible to exert a unilateral influence on the society, public opinion and foreign policy of another country. A country and its society inevitably become the objects of public diplomacy, 'soft power' and 'smart power' exercised by other countries and organisations. This external factor can influence a country's domestic political life, its transformation or modernisation. Examining and researching this issue through the *'subject–object'* lens could give rise to a new academic discourse in the field of public diplomacy.

Further research in this area could also address the challenge of assessing the effectiveness and extent of public diplomacy's impact on a particular country or issue. An effective model and criteria for systematic assessment have not yet been developed or reflected in the academic literature. Further research into public diplomacy and the concepts of 'soft' and 'smart' power is both relevant and necessary for international relations scholars and for government bodies, institutions, organizations, and public policy as a whole.

It should be noted that in recent years, public diplomacy has evolved in its practical implementation in each country along lines relevant to its foreign policy, serving as the most effective tool for that country and its capabilities. Examples of this include cultural diplomacy, which is often carried out more effectively by a country's diaspora than by its diplomatic missions, and *media diplomacy*, which can be tailored to specific regions of the world and reach the widest possible target audience. In this context, the focus is no longer so much on creating a favourable image of one's country in foreign societies, as was characteristic of traditional public diplomacy. The main objective of a country's media diplomacy becomes other foreign policy priorities, such as promoting relevant narratives, strengthening cultural presence, and so on. For this reason, another promising direction for future research into media diplomacy may be the study of its transformations into new forms of implementation and the alignment of each with the state's contemporary foreign policy objectives.

References [Список використаної літератури]

Allan, B. B. (2018). From subjects to objects: Knowledge in International Relations theory. *European Journal of International Relations,* 24(4), 841–864. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066117741529. [in English]. [Allan B. B. From subjects to objects: Knowledge in International Relations theory. *European Journal of International Relations.* 2018. Vol. 24, No. 4. P. 841–864. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066117741529].

Ang, I., Isar, Y. R., & Mar, P. (2015). Cultural diplomacy: Beyond the national interest? *International Journal of Cultural Policy,* 21(4), 365–381. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1042474. [in English]. [Ang I., Isar Y. R., Mar P. Cultural diplomacy: Beyond the national interest? *International Journal of Cultural Policy.* 2015. Vol. 21, No. 4. P. 365–381. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1042474].

Ayhan, K. J. (2019). The boundaries of public diplomacy and non-state actors: A taxonomy of perspectives. *International Studies Perspectives,* 20(1), 63–83. https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/eky010. [in English]. [Ayhan K. J. The boundaries of public diplomacy and non-state actors: A taxonomy of perspectives. *International Studies Perspectives.* 2019. Vol. 20, No. 1. P. 63–83. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/eky010].

Blinken, A. J. (2002). Winning the war of ideas. *The Washington Quarterly,* 25(2), 101–114. https://doi.org/10.1162/016366002528201 62. [in English]. [Blinken A. J. Winning the war of ideas. *The Washington Quarterly.* 2002. Vol. 25, No. 2. P. 101–114. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/016366002528201 62].

Bjola, C., Cassidy, J., & Manor, I. (2019). Public diplomacy in the digital age. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy,* 14(1–2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-14011032. [in English]. [Bjola C., Cassidy J., Manor I. Public diplomacy in the digital age. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*. 2019. Vol. 14, No. 1–2. P. 83–101. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-14011032].

Carr, E. H. (1946). The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations. London: Macmillan. [in English]. [Carr E. H. The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations. London: Macmillan, 1946].

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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207311877. [in English]. [Castells M. The new public sphere: Global civil society, communication networks, and global governance. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2008. Vol. 616, No. 1. P. 78–93. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207311877].

Christopher, R. (2002). Public diplomacy comes of age. *The Washington Quarterly,* 25(2), 73–83. https://doi.org/10.1162/01636600252820144. [in English]. [Christopher R. Public diplomacy comes of age. *The Washington Quarterly*. 2002. Vol. 25, No. 2. P. 73–83. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/01636600252820144].

Cull, N. J. (2007). Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past. Los Angeles: Figueroa Press, University of Southern California. [in English]. [Cull N. J. Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past. Los Angeles: Figueroa Press, University of Southern California, 2007].

Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy: Taxonomies and histories. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 616(1), 31–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207311952. [in English]. [Cull N. J. Public diplomacy: Taxonomies and histories. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2008. Vol. 616, No. 1. P. 31–54. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207311952].

Cull, N. J. (2022). From soft power to reputational security: Rethinking public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy for a dangerous age. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy,* 18(1), 18–21. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-021-00236-0. [in English]. [Cull N. J. From soft power to reputational security: Rethinking public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy for a dangerous age. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. 2022. Vol. 18, No. 1. P. 18–21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-021-00236-0].

Gilboa, E. (1998). Media diplomacy: Conceptual divergence and applications. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics,* 3(3), 56–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/1081180X98003003005. [in English]. [Gilboa E. Media diplomacy: Conceptual divergence and applications. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*. 1998. Vol. 3, No. 3. P. 56–75. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1081180X98003003005].

Gilboa, E. (2001). Diplomacy in the media age: Three models of uses and effects. *Diplomacy & Statecraft,* 12(2), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/09592290108406201. [in English]. [Gilboa E. Diplomacy in the media age: Three models of uses and effects. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. 2001. Vol. 12, No. 2. P. 1–28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/09592290108406201].

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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207312142. [in English]. [Gilboa E. Searching for a theory of public diplomacy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2008. Vol. 616, No. 1. P. 55–77. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207312142].

Hoffman, A. S. (Ed.). (1968). International Communication and the New Diplomacy. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. [in English]. [Hoffman A. S. (Ed.). International Communication and the New Diplomacy. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968].

Kalin, I. (2011). Soft power and public diplomacy in Turkey. Perceptions, 16(3), 5–23. [in English]. [Kalin I. Soft power and public diplomacy in Turkey. Perceptions. 2011. Vol. 16, No. 3. P. 5–23].

Leonard, M. (2002). Public Diplomacy. London: The Foreign Policy Centre. [in English]. [Leonard M. Public Diplomacy. London: The Foreign Policy Centre, 2002].

Melissen, J. (Ed.). (2005). The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. [in English]. [Melissen J. (Ed.). The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005].

Nisbet, E. C., Nisbet, M. C., Scheufele, D. A., & Shanahan, J. E. (2004). Public diplomacy, television news, and Muslim opinion. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics,* 9(2), 11–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/1081180X04263459. [in English]. [Nisbet E. C., Nisbet M. C., Scheufele D. A., Shanahan J. E. Public diplomacy, television news, and Muslim opinion. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*. 2004. Vol. 9, No. 2. P. 11–37. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1081180X04263459].

Nye, J. S. (1990). Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power. New York: Basic Books. [in English]. [Nye J. S. Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power. New York: Basic Books, 1990].

Nye, J. S. (2003). The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone. New York: Oxford University Press. [in English]. [Nye J. S. The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003].
Nye, J. S. (2004). Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. New York: PublicAffairs. [in English]. [Nye J. S. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. New York: PublicAffairs, 2004].
Nye, J. S., & Armitage, R. S. (2007). A Smarter, More Secure America: Report of the Commission on Smart Power. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies. [in English]. [Nye J. S., Armitage R. S. A Smarter, More Secure America: Report of the Commission on Smart Power. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2007].
Snow, N., & Taylor, P. M. (Eds.). (2009). Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy. New York: Routledge. [in English]. [Snow N., Taylor P. M. (Eds.). Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy. New York: Routledge, 2009].
Syvak, T. V. (2019). Stratehichni komunikatsii u systemi publichnoho upravlinnia Ukrainy [Strategic Communications in the Public Administration System of Ukraine]. Kyiv: NAPA. [in Ukrainian]. [Сивак Т. В. Стратегічні комунікації у системі публічного управління України. Київ: НАДУ, 2019. 338 с.].
Tuch, H. N. (1990). Communicating with the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. [in English]. [Tuch H. N. Communicating with the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1990].
United States Information Agency Alumni Association. (2002, September 1). What Is Public Diplomacy? http://pdaa.publicdiplomacy.org/?page_id=6. [in English]. [United States Information Agency Alumni Association. What Is Public Diplomacy? 1 September 2002. URL: http://pdaa.publicdiplomacy.org/?page_id=6].
Yeşil, B. (2015). Transnationalization of Turkish dramas: Exploring the convergence of local and global market imperatives. *Global Media and Communication,* 11(1), 43–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742766515573274. [in English]. [Yeşil B. Transnationalization of Turkish dramas: Exploring the convergence of local and global market imperatives. *Global Media and Communication.* 2015. Vol. 11, No. 1. P. 43–60. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1742766515573274].

Ю. М. Тарасюк
кафедра соціальних наук і регіональних досліджень
Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова
ауд. 37, Французький бульвар, 24/26, м. Одеса, 65058, Україна

КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ПУБЛІЧНОЇ ДИПЛОМАТІЇ: ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ПІДХОДИ, ТИПОЛОГІЯ ТА ЕВОЛЮЦІЯ

Резюме
В останні роки на тлі глобалізації та стрімкого розвитку інформаційно-комунікаційних технологій значно зросли можливості громадян впливати на політику своїх урядів. У зв'язку з цим уряди, які прагнуть зберегти та розширити свій вплив у глобальному масштабі, намагаються адаптувати планування та реалізацію своєї зовнішньої політики до цих нових тенденцій. У статті здійснено теоретичний аналіз публічної дипломатії та її еволюції крізь призму фундаментальних положень ліберальної та реалістичної парадигм. Аналіз наукових праць представлено в хронологічному порядку – від запровадження терміна «публічна дипломатія» в політологічний дискурс Е. Ґалліоном до його сучасного конструктивного переосмислення М. Леонардом, С. Анхольтом і Н. Куллом. Окреслено етапи трансформації поняття, а також зміни сфери застосування та концептуальних меж оновленої доктрини публічної дипломатії з урахуванням впливу історичних подій і відповідних змін у системі міжнародних відносин. Особливу увагу приділено дослідженню концепцій Джозефа Ная щодо «м'якої», «жорсткої» та «розумної» сили, а також прикладам їх застосування державами у зовнішньополітичній діяльності на міжнародній арені. На основі вивчення джерел та історіографії з цієї проблематики авторка пропонує відповідне визначення поняття «публічна дипломатія» як

інструменту та напряму зовнішньої політики, що реалізується в межах діяльності державних і недержавних політичних інституцій та акторів задля здійснення комплексної дипломатичної стратегії, спрямованої на вплив на населення іноземної держави з метою формування її політичних процесів і процесу ухвалення рішень. У висновках порушується питання про необхідність вивчення урядами та суспільствами різних країн практичного застосування основних принципів публічної дипломатії. У дослідженні наведено приклади публічної дипломатії різних держав – США, Туреччини та України, які використано як кейси й ілюстрації теоретичного матеріалу. Водночас, на думку авторки, практичне впровадження публічної дипломатії та оцінювання ефективності розроблення нових інструментів «м'якої сили» потребують подальших досліджень. Це зумовлює необхідність застосування нового підходу до вивчення публічної дипломатії конкретної держави − крізь призму взаємодії «суб'єкт – об'єкт». На думку авторки, такий підхід дасть змогу публічній дипломатії ефективніше виконувати свою роль у зовнішньополітичній стратегії, а також оцінювати вплив публічної дипломатії іноземних держав на внутрішньополітичні процеси.

Ключові слова: публічна дипломатія, зовнішня політика, концепція, м'яка сила, розумна сила.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 27.08.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 16.10.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 25.11.2026