



2021

MARPE Diplo Glossary

Anne-Marie Cotton, H el ene Boulanger, Susana Carvalho,
Anca Anton, S onia Sebasti ao



Table of Contents

01 — THE **MARPE DIPLO GLOSSARY**

02 — THE CONCEPTS

COMMUNICATION AND DIPLOMACY

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

ORGANISATIONAL DIPLOMACY

CIVIL SOCIETY DIPLOMACY

03 — REFERENCE LIST

04 — DISCLAIMER

05 — CONTACT

The MARPE Diplo Glossary



The MARPE Diplo Glossary

The MARPE Network developed the MARPE Diplo Erasmus+ project from 2018 to 2021. The project initially aimed to explore public, corporate, and civic diplomacy, an emerging discipline in the fields of international relations and communication sciences, political sciences, and strategic studies, to research and to develop its wider applications in the context of business and civil society communication.

The objective was and still is to develop a European perspective drawing on public sphere (Habermas) and network society influences (Castells) as there is an increasing need for showing more transparency and sensitivity over operations, processes, and overall governance.

However, over the period of these three years, the critical reflections led the MARPE Diplo team to re-conceptualise the triad from "public, corporate and civic" into "public, organisational and civil society" diplomacy.

The MARPE Diplo Glossary

Based on our previous Erasmus project reflecting on public relations, governmental affairs, and lobbying from a European perspective, we concluded we were ready to explore the strategic level from 3 complementary perspectives: a European one, a communication or public relations one, and a diplomatic perspective.

We identified that the European institutions are driven by power, aiming for consensus. We recognised the EU is still building its European narrative. This highlighted the importance of a society-driven perspective focusing on the citizens, while not always being EU-centered, as well as the importance of ethics.

Ethics are at the core of communication and public relations when dealing, for instance, with representation. We were exploring a strategic level, going beyond an instrumental approach. Considering that the European perspective on public relations focuses on publics, we adopted the same society-driven approach.

When analysing the EU-communication strategies, we discussed the representation and negotiation functions, linking diplomacy and public relations. Indeed, when looking at their intersection, representation, negotiation, advocacy, all of them, nurtured by monitoring and intelligence, are shared practices of both disciplines.

The MARPE Diplo Glossary

Mirroring the focus on citizens and publics mentioned in the European and the communication perspectives, we considered adding a comparable focus to diplomacy. This led us to the concept of “public diplomacy”, shaping the public opinion of third parties.

To sum up our MARPE Diplo project: we identified 3 pillars.

Public diplomacy is a direct result of the intersection of public relations and diplomacy. We consider public diplomacy as the contribution of a public relations way of thinking to diplomacy.

Initially, we considered corporate diplomacy as a second pillar, as not only States are active actors in public opinion, but also companies are. But not only business is: all kinds of organisations are. This is why we decided to move from corporate diplomacy to organisational diplomacy. We consider organisational diplomacy as the contribution of a diplomacy way of thinking to public relations.

We also had a conceptual move from civic diplomacy towards civil society diplomacy as the latter is not only reflecting a public-centric but, in essence, a society-driven perspective. We consider civil society diplomacy as a combination of PR and diplomacy driven by the actors of the public sphere.

The MARPE Diplo Glossary

In addition to allowing us to identify new concepts, this approach also confronted us with the need to align on the definition of concepts often taken for granted but also susceptible to a variety of understandings. We followed a quite unique approach “how to” organise the MARPE Diplo Glossary.

Firstly, the Glossary is based on co-creation. This means the MARPE Diplo team is constructing a body of knowledge and building on an epistemic community together with students, practitioners and supported by associated partners.

Secondly, the selection of defined concepts is articulated based on the combination of “out-of-the-box” thinking and research driven reflection.

And last but not least, the MARPE Diplo Glossary integrates a multidisciplinary approach: from communication sciences, international relations, political science, law, strategic studies, pedagogy, management and business. It is organised based on four dimensions:

- Communication and Diplomacy,
- Public diplomacy,
- Organisational diplomacy,
- Civil society diplomacy.



The Concepts



Concept list

Communication and Diplomacy	Public diplomacy	Organisational diplomacy	Civil society diplomacy
B			
Business diplomacy	■		
C			
Citizen diplomacy	■ ■		
Citizen diplomats	■ ■		
Citizenship	■		
Civic diplomacy	■ ■		
Civil society diplomacy		■	
Co-creation	■		
Communication	■		
Corporate diplomacy	■		
D			
Dialogic communication	■ ■		
Digital diplomacy	■ ■ ■ ■		
Diplomacy	■ ■ ■ ■		
Diplomat	■ ■		
E			
Economic diplomacy	■		
Epistemic community	■		
Ethics	■		
F			
Foreign policy	■		
L			
Legitimacy			■
N			
Non-state actors			■ ■ ■
Non-state civil society diplomacy agents			■
O			
Organisational diplomacy			■
P			
Political science and International relations			■
Power (soft, hard, smart)			■
Professionalisation			■
Public diplomacy			■
Public diplomat			■
Public Relations			■
Public relations professional			■
S			
Science diplomacy			■
Social movements			■
Strategic communication			■
Strategy			■
T			
Transparency			■
Trust			■

Business diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

"Business diplomacy pertains to the management of interfaces between the global company and its multiple non-business counterparts (such as NGOs, governments, political parties, media and other representatives of civil societies) and external constituencies". It differs from commercial diplomacy, which is focused on continuation and structural cohesion, whereas business diplomacy is focused on the relationship with governments and with other non-business stakeholders to be conducive to subsidiaries and to reduce uncertainties and risks" (Saner & Yiu, 2005, p. 302).

"Business diplomacy [represents] the activities deployed by international businesses with host government representatives and non-governmental representatives in order to establish and sustain a positive relationship to maintain legitimacy" (Ruel, 2015, p. 3).

REFERENCE(S)

Ruël, H. J. (2015). *Business diplomacy: a definition and operationalization*. Windesheim University of Applied Sciences.

Saner, R., & Yiu, L. (2005). Swiss Executives as Business Diplomats in the New Europe: Evidence from Swiss Pharmaceutical and Agro-Industrial Global Companies. *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(3), 298-312.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Mogensen, K. (2017). From public relations to corporate public diplomacy. *Public Relations Review*, 43(3), 605-614. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.03.011

Citizen diplomacy


 Public diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Citizen diplomacy is a subset of public diplomacy (Mueller, 2009), based on the notion that “every global citizen has the right, even the responsibility, to engage across cultures and create shared understanding through meaningful person-to-person interactions”, as put forward by Dwight Eisenhower in his 1956 “People to People” speech (The Center for Citizen Diplomacy, 2019). This perspective recognises the democratisation of diplomacy and the access of non-state actors (NSAs) to the diplomatic scene; however, the agenda that is served, knowingly or unknowingly, by these actors is a state agenda. Albeit this move from a state-centric to a public-centric perspective, the public remains either the agent or the target of citizen diplomacy, while the state is the initiator, supporter, or enabler. Citizen diplomacy (sometimes referred to as people to people (P2P) diplomacy) develops primarily around the individual citizen and its role in state-centric public diplomacy, focusing on the person-to-person interactions and relationship-building process.

REFERENCE(S)

Mueller, S. (2009). The Nexus of U.S. Public Diplomacy and Citizen Diplomacy. In N. Snow, & P. M. Taylor (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy* (pp. 101-107). New York: Routledge.

The Center for Citizen Diplomacy. *Understanding Citizen Diplomacy*. Retrieved from <https://www.centerforcitizendiplomacy.org/about-us/understanding/>

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Anton, A. (2021). Conceptual Pathways to Civil Society Diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 5). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Citizen diplomats

Public diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Citizen diplomats, either as advocates of a particular international cause or autonomous agents in international relations, all employ mediatisation and promotional practices (branding, public relations, etc.) to position themselves as “assertive participants in globalized relations” (Bolweski, 2007, p. 70), acting in line with a state agenda either knowingly or unknowingly. The citizen diplomats can “represent themselves, collectivities such as sub-state, supra-state and trans-state communities, sovereign states on occasion, single-purpose enterprises, and ideas or policies [...] to various iterations of the international community, as well as to states and non-state actors” (Sharp, 2001, p. 137). The function of the citizen diplomat is the expression of “the public’s desire to participate in national and international decision-making” (Stanzel, 2018, p. 62).

REFERENCE(S)

Bolewski, W. (2007). Citizen diplomats and public relations diplomacy: popularization of diplomacy. In W. Bolewski, *Diplomacy and International Law in Globalized Relations* (pp. 69-72). Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer.

Sharp, P. (2001). Making Sense of Citizen Diplomats: The People of Duluth, Minnesota, as International Actors. *International Studies Perspectives*, 2(2), 131-150.

Stanzel, V. (Ed.). (2018). *New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century*. German Institute for International and Security Affairs. Retrieved from https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/research_papers/2018RP11_sze.pdf

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Anton, A. & Moise, R. (2021). The Citizen Diplomats and their Pathway to Diplomatic Power. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 13). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Citizenship

Public diplomacy

"Citizenship is the democratic principle and it is understood as a sense of belonging, investment and involvement in certain territory. It includes duties, responsibilities and rights of the individual as a member of a nation or state. Classical dimensions of citizenship include: a) a mandatory legal bond (identity document, passport); b) a political right and duty tied to institutional political participation; c) an economic participation as worker and consumer; and d) civic engagement" (Sebastião, 2015).

REFERENCE(S)

Sebastião, S. P. (2015). Digitania© or the disillusion with a digital citizenship. *Comunicação Pública* [Online], 10(18). DOI: 10.4000/cp.988

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Kalu, K. N. (2017). *Citizenship: Identity, Institutions, and the Postmodern Challenge*. New York: Routledge.

Civic diplomacy


 Public diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

There are two dominant perspectives on civic diplomacy. (1) A US, state-centric, public diplomacy perspective, overlapping with the citizen diplomacy concept, in which non-state actors are, to various degrees, instrumentalised across borders by governmental authorities, but are “in the position where they can influence the agenda or the course of action, moving from being a static to a dynamic actor, stating their availability for engagement and demanding to be a part of the diplomatic undertaking” (Anton, 2021, chapter 5). (2) An Asian, integrative, networked perspective, in which “civic diplomacy puts city and local governments at the forefront of foreign policy along with civil society organizations, including transnational religious organizations, in place of governments and corporations” (Yi & Hayes, 2015, p. 335).

REFERENCE(S)

Anton, A. (2021). Conceptual Pathways to Civil Society Diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 5). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Yi, K., & Hayes, P. (2015). The Implications of Civic Diplomacy for ROK Foreign Policy. In P. Hayes, & K. Yi (Eds.), *Complexity, Security and Civil Society in East Asia. Foreign Policies and the Korean Peninsula* (pp. 319-392). Cambridge: Open Book Publishers. DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0059

Civil society diplomacy


 Civil society diplomacy

"Civil society diplomacy is performed/carried out by civil society organisations (CSOs), transnational civil society networks, transnational movements and/or individuals emerging from civil society for societal interests, causes and issues and acting across borders. It can be seen as the equivalent of state public diplomacy, but originating in the public sphere, performed by civil society agents and serving the (global) public interest that is not conditioned by the state-defined national interest. [...]"

Civil society diplomacy mirrors the diplomatic actions of the state, on the one hand (conventional diplomacy and public/citizen diplomacy) and those of organisations in general and companies in particular, on the other. However, it should not be explored using the mould of traditional, public or even corporate diplomacy. The state and the corporation are well defined in their roles, structures, objectives and modus operandi. Civil society does not work in the same way and neither does its diplomacy; instead, it is fluid, diffuse, less structured and, to some extent, unpredictable if we try to anticipate its dynamics using models developed for other societal systems" (Anton, 2021, chapter 4).

REFERENCE(S)

Anton, A. (2021). Conceptual Pathways to Civil Society Diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 5). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Co-creation

Communication and Diplomacy

Co-creation is the "enactment of interactional creation across interactive system-environments (afforded by interactive platforms) entailing agencing engagements and structuring organizations. Interactional creation is enacted by means of interactions of 'agencial assemblages', while agencing engagements and structuring organizations enable and constrain interactions. Interactive platforms, e.g. instantiations of agencial assemblages, are composed of heterogeneous relations of artifacts, processes, interfaces, and persons. Aided by digitalized technologies, interactive platforms afford a multiplicity of interactive system-environments that connect creatural interactions with how experienced outcomes emerge from their underlying resourced capabilities" (Ramaswamy & Ozcan, 2018, p. 196).

REFERENCE(S)

Ramaswamy, V., & Ozcan, K. (2018). What is co-creation? An interactional creation framework and its implications for value creation. *Journal of Business Research*, 84, 196-205.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Cotton, A.-M. (2019). Educational Discourse and Digital Media: toward co-regulated learning? *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis*, 55(2), 115-144.

Communication

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

"Communication is the human activity that constitutes Man's relationship with the world. It is the basis for creating and maintaining relationships between individuals. Communication also allows the constitution of organisations, other collective forms of association and academic fields. Therefore, a communicational perspective becomes vital given that it focuses on and explains organisational and organising activities. Organisations are hereby largely understood as socially constructed realities largely by communicative interactions with the publics to create and assign meanings" (Sebastião, 2021, Introduction).

REFERENCE(S)

Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Introduction: the rationale for a communication perspective. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (Introduction). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Corporate diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

"Corporate diplomacy is linked to business, to its legitimacy to operate in an international environment, as it addresses its narratives to foreign publics, and aims to establish favourable settings for business activities" (de Carvalho Spínola & Cotton, 2021, chapter 4). "Corporate diplomacy is the capability that some major transnational corporations develop to draft and implement their own programs, independent from the government's initiative, to pursue similar diplomatic aims" (Ordeix-Rigo & Duarte, 2009, p. 555).

"In corporate diplomacy, corporations are looking to take new roles in society (...) revealing an understanding that their presence in society is only sustainable if and only if they are able to satisfy expectations from multiple stakeholders" (Ordeix-Rigo & Duarte, 2009, p. 556).

REFERENCE(S)

- de Carvalho Spínola, S. & Cotton, A.-M. (2021). From corporate to organisational diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 4). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7
- Ordeix-Rigo, E., & Duarte, J. (2009). From public diplomacy to corporate diplomacy: increasing corporation's legitimacy and influence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(4), 549-564. DOI: 10.1177/0002764209347630

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

- Bolewski, W. (2019). Diplomatic engagement with transnational corporations: a path to sustainable governance. *International Journal of Diplomacy and Economy*, 5(1), 42-52. DOI: 10.1504/IJDIPE.2019.099140.
- Mogensen, K. (2020). Dialogue and business legitimacy. In J. D. Rendtorff, *Handbook of business legitimacy. Responsibility, Ethics and Society* (pp. 556-570). Springer.
- Ruël, H. J., & Wolters, T. (2016). Business Diplomacy. In C. M. Constantinou, P. Kerr, & P. Sharp, *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Saner, R., Yiu, L., & Sondergaard, M. (2000). Business Diplomacy Management: A Core Competency for Global Companies. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 80-92.
- Steger, U. (2003). Corporate diplomacy. *The strategy for a volatile, fragmented business environment*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Dialogic communication

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

The dialogic communication theory is based on Grunig and Hunt's four models of public relations, particularly on two-way symmetric communication (Grunig, 2009), as well as on Kent and Taylor's (1998) five dialogic communication principles for the World Wide Web (the dialogic loop, usefulness of information, the generation of return visits, intuitiveness, and the rule of the conservation). In the latter, dialogic communication is considered a theoretical framework that can guide relationship building between organisations and publics; however, it refers to a particular type of relational interaction – one in which a relationship exists, with dialogue being the product rather than the process (Kent & Taylor, 1998, p. 322).

In digital public diplomacy, particularly social media (Twitter, Facebook) diplomacy, three of the principles are primarily used – the dialogic loop, usefulness of information, and the generation of return visits – due to their relevance for examination and measurement of social media engagement between government institutions and the foreign public (Ittefaq, 2019). A true understanding and implementation of the dialogic communication principles by public diplomacy actors ensures a public-centric approach instead of a state-centric one in which the citizen is seen as an instrument in advancing foreign policy (Anton & Lăcătuș, 2021, chapter 12).

REFERENCE(S)

- Anton, A. & Lăcătuș, M. (2021). Digital Diplomacy. The Case of the Embassy of Sweden in Bucharest. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 12). Cham: Springer.
- Grunig, J. E. (2009). Paradigms of global public relations in an age of digitalisation. *PRism*, 6(2), 1-19.
- Ittefaq, M. (2019). Digital Diplomacy via Social Networks: A Cross-National Analysis of Governmental Usage of Facebook and Twitter for Digital Engagement. *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, 18(1), 49-69. DOI: 10.17477/jcea.2019.18.1.049
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the world wide web. *Public Relations Review*, 24(3), 321-334. DOI: 10.1016/S0363-8111(99)80143-X

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

- Manor, I. (2019). *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy*. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-04405-3

Digital diplomacy

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

As the internet has become an unquestionable channel for diplomatic communication, it has altered the practice of diplomacy and it boosted the professionalisation of public diplomacy practice. The use of social media by diplomats has opened communication between policymakers and citizens. These tools, especially Facebook and Twitter, provide diplomatic missions with direct access to citizens, and vice versa, both inside and outside of their countries. This communication often bypasses state and media filters, potentially enabling countries -and their foreign affairs representatives- to more effectively influence foreign audiences and achieve diplomatic objectives (Adesina, 2017).

Digital diplomacy (Bjola, 2015) has been used interchangeably with other terms as "diplomacy 2.0" (Harris, 2013), "public diplomacy 2.0" (Hallams, 2010), "e-diplomacy" (Hocking, Melissen, Riordan, & Sharp, 2012), "cyber-diplomacy" (Barston, 2014), "virtual diplomacy", "net diplomacy" (Wehrenfennig, 2012), or "twiplomacy" (Sandre, 2012).

REFERENCE(S)

- Adesina, O. S. (2017). Foreign policy in an era of digital diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1). DOI: 10.1080/23311886.2017.1297175
- Barston, R. (2014). *Modern diplomacy* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Bjola, C. (2015). Introduction: Making sense of digital diplomacy. In C. Bjola & M. Holmes (Eds.), *Digital diplomacy: Theory and practice* (pp. 1–9). New York: Routledge.
- Hallams, E. (2010). Digital diplomacy: The internet, the battle for ideas & US foreign policy. *CEU Political Science Journal*, 4, 538–574.
- Harris, B. (2013). Diplomacy 2.0: The future of social media in nation branding. *The Journal of Public Diplomacy*, 4, Art. 3.
- Sandre, A. (2012). *Twiplomacy is bringing diplomacy back to relevancy*. Retrieved from <http://www.diplomacy.edu/blog/twiplomacy-bringing-diplomacy-back-relevancy>
- Wehrenfennig, D. (2012). From an analog past to a digital future: Information and communication technology. In S. S. Costigan & J. Perry (Eds.), *Cyberspaces and global affairs* (chapter 23). London: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315575711

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

- Manor, I. (2019). *The digitalization of public diplomacy*. New York: Springer International Publishing.

Diplomacy

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Diplomacy is a form of negotiation between two or more states, being considered and largely accepted as “an instrument of foreign policy to establish and develop peaceful relations among governments of different states, using diplomatic agents as facilitators mutually recognized by the parts” (Magalhães, 1982, p. 88). Interactions between representatives of sovereign states as a mode of conducting diplomacy remains crucial.

The core diplomatic practice is negotiation and the two core functions of diplomacy are representation and communication (Pigman, 2010). Diplomacy is umbilically linked to the political and military sphere - considered as hard power - which gives it credibility and legitimacy. Diplomacy has an obvious relation between theory and practice (Guiora, Cotton & Sebastião, 2021).

Diplomacy involves four kinds of function: (1) Representational (rhetoric, oratory, advocacy); (2) Dialogic (negotiation, peace-making); (3) Advisory (counselling); (4) Intelligence gathering (L’Etang, 2006, pp. 374-375).

Diplomacy is the “engine room” of international relations (Cohen, 1998, p. 1). It is the established method by which states articulate their foreign policy objectives and co-ordinate their efforts to influence the decisions and behaviour of foreign governments and peoples through dialogue, negotiations and other such measures, short of war and violence. It is, in other words, the centuries-long means by which states seek to secure particular or wider interests, including the reduction of frictions between or among themselves. It is the core instrument through which the goals, strategies and broad tactics of foreign policy are implemented. It strives to preserve peace and aims at developing goodwill towards foreign states and peoples with a view to ensuring their cooperation or, failing that, their neutrality (Adesina, 2017).

Diplomacy

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

REFERENCE(S)

- Adesina, O. S. (2017). Foreign policy in an era of digital diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1297175.
- Balão, S. R., & Almeida e Silva, T. (2021). Diplomacy in the Context of Political Science, International Relations and Strategic Studies. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 2). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7
- Cohen, R. (1998). *Putting diplomatic studies on the map*. *Diplomatic studies program newsletter*. Leicester: Centre for the Study of Diplomacy.
- Guiora, A., Cotton, A.-M., Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Public Diplomats & Public Relations Practitioners: similar functions but distinct professional status and recognition? In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 6). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7
- L'Etang, J. (2006). Public relations as diplomacy. In J. L'Etang & M. Pieczka (Eds.), *Public Relations. Critical debates and contemporary practice* (pp. 373-388). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Magalhães, J. (1982). *Diplomacia Pura* [Pure Diplomacy]. Associação Portuguesa para o Estudo das Relações Internacionais. Lisboa: Bertrand Editora.
- Pigman, G. A. (2010). *Contemporary Diplomacy. Representation and Communication in a Globalized World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Diplomat

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Diplomats are:

1. Those professionals to whom the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations applies, which implies accreditation to a state or an international organisation.
2. Those engaged in diplomatic activities such as national representation, information gathering and analysis, communication, networking, coalition building, and negotiation.
3. Those who share a way of life that combines shared attitudes, values, and approaches, as well as their own language game" (Guiora, Cotton & Sebastião, 2021).

Diplomats are the actors involved in the diplomatic process as the loyal carriers of a long tradition. They are characterised as agents responsible for ensuring trust and maintaining diplomatic relations.

REFERENCE(S)

- Guiora, A., Cotton, A.-M. & Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Diplomats & Public Relations Practitioners: similar functions but distinct professional status and recognition? In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 6). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7
- Riordan, S. (2019). *Cyberdiplomacy. Managing security and governance online*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

- United Nations (2005). *Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. United Nations 1961*. Treaty Series, vol. 500, p. 95. Available at https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/9_1_1961.pdf

Economic diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Referring to the economic diplomacy trinity as a conceptual framework and as a key foreign policy instrument, "the three economic diplomacy strands of commercial diplomacy (the promotion of international trade, investment, and tourism), trade diplomacy (bilateral, regional and multilateral negotiations on trade and investment agreements), and development cooperation" (Okano-Heijmans & Asano, 2018, p. 251), including a more outspoken, visible element of geostrategic power play and limited securitisation, constituting a pragmatic reorientation to the rapidly changing global environment.

REFERENCE(S)

Okano-Heijmans, M., & Asano, T. (2018). Economic diplomacy. In M. McCarthy, *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Foreign Policy* (pp. 251-266). London: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315643076

Epistemic community

Communication and Diplomacy

"An epistemic community is a network of professionals from a variety of disciplines and backgrounds. They have (1) a shared set of normative and principled beliefs, which provide a value-based rationale for the social action of community members; (2) shared causal beliefs, which are derived from their analysis of practices leading or contributing to a central set of problems in their domain and which they serve as the basis for elucidating the multiple linkages between possible policy actions and desired outcomes; (3) shared notions of validity – that is, intersubjective, internally defined criteria for weighing and validating knowledge in the domain of their expertise; and (4) a common policy enterprise – that is, a set of common practices associated with a set of problems to which their professional competence is directed, presumably out of the conviction that human welfare will be enhanced as a consequence" (Haas, 1992, p. 2).

REFERENCE(S)

Haas, P.M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Politics Coordination. *International Organization*, 46(1), 1-35. DOI: 10.1017/S0020818300001442

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Meyer, M. & Molyneux-Hodgson, S. (2010). Introduction: The Dynamics of Epistemic Communities. *Sociological Research Online*, 15(2), 109-115. DOI: 10.5153/sro.2154

Ethics

Communication and Diplomacy

"Ethics is a Kantian heritage in Western thought, linked to the principles of moral value, duty and goodwill. Inserted in the theoretical scope of moral philosophy, it maintains that individuals are obliged to act according to the concept of duty (towards them and towards society) and attention to consequences. In a deontological sense, any action should be preceded by answers to four questions: What can I know? What should I do? What can I hope for? What is man?" (Sebastião, 2021, chapter 15).

REFERENCE(S)

Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Becoming an Ethical ambassador: proposal for a PR & PD Practitioner Course on Ethics. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 15). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Foreign policy

Communication and Diplomacy

Foreign policy is “the activity of a State outside its political borders” and the expression is used to “designate the State sector activity which aims to get a certain result in a bilateral or multilateral relation”. Foreign Policy is an aspect of International Politics being the former considered as the “conjugation of interactions among different States, which means that International Politics is the gathering of all the different national Foreign Policies” (Magalhães, 1982, p. 19).

REFERENCE(S)

Balão, S. R., & Almeida e Silva, T. (2021). Diplomacy in the Context of Political Science, International Relations and Strategic Studies. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 2). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Magalhães, J. (1982). *Diplomacia Pura* [Pure Diplomacy]. Associação Portuguesa para o Estudo das Relações Internacionais. Lisboa: Bertrand Editora.

Legitimacy

Communication and Diplomacy

"Legitimacy is a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (Suchman, 1995, p. 574).

REFERENCE(S)

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571-610.

Non-state actors

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Non-state actors are business sector and civil society diplomatic actors (individuals and/or organisations) that do not represent, nor emerge from states or state structures. These include corporations, business enterprises, civil society organisations (CSOs), communities, individuals, informal (pressure, interest, etc.) groups, armed groups and, arguably, social movements that are not affiliated with, funded by or directed by the government, but that can engage with the latter, as well as with each other following a state, an organisational, a society or an individual diplomatic agenda (Anton, 2021, chapter 5; Anton & Lăcătuș, 2021, chapter 12; de Carvalho Spínola & Cotton, 2021, chapter 4).

REFERENCE(S)

Anton, A. (2021). Conceptual Pathways to Civil Society Diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 5). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Anton, A. & Lăcătuș, M. (2021). Digital Diplomacy. The Case of the Embassy of Sweden in Bucharest. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 12). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

de Carvalho Spínola, S. & Cotton, A.-M. (2021). From corporate to organisational diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 4). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Josselin, D., Wallace, W. (2001). Non-state Actors in World Politics: a Framework. In D. Josselin, W. Wallace (Eds.), *Non-state Actors in World Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9781403900906_1

Langhorne, R. (2005). The Diplomacy of Non-State Actors. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 16(2), 331-339. DOI: 10.1080/09592290590948388

Non-state civil society diplomacy agents



Civil society diplomacy

Not-for-profit non-state agents emerging from civil society that initiate and engage in diplomatic actions: “civil society organisations (CSOs), transnational civil society networks, transnational movements and/or individuals emerging from civil society for societal interests, causes and issues and acting across borders” (Anton, 2021, chapter 5).

REFERENCE(S)

Anton, A. (2021). Conceptual Pathways to Civil Society Diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 5). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Organisational diplomacy



Organisational diplomacy

"Organisational diplomacy is the role that formal transnational organisations play in advancing the interests that arise from their statutes by negotiating and creating alliances with key external players including governments, analysts, the media, non-governmental organisations, and companies, to obtain social acceptance and create an area of public influence. This is how they can achieve the legitimacy to accomplish their mission and vision abroad" (de Carvalho Spínola & Cotton, 2021, chapter 4).

REFERENCE(S)

de Carvalho Spínola, S. & Cotton, A.-M. (2021). From corporate to organisational diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 4). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Political science and International relations

Communication and Diplomacy

Political science is a social science that studies political systems, organisations, and political processes. It involves the study of the structure and processes of government or any equivalent system of human organisation that attempts to ensure security, justice, and civil rights. According to Sartori (1973, p. 5), it includes two variables: (1) the state of the organisation of knowledge (science), and (2) the degree of structural differentiation within the framework of human collectivities. Political science was born with Aristotle, reborn with Machiavelli, and matured into an autonomous discipline in the nineteenth century. Political science can shortly be defined as the study of politics, that is, as the study of all forms of power relations between individuals. Modern political science can be divided into the three subdisciplines of comparative politics, international relations, and political theory (Caramani, 2020). "The study of international relations emerged as a result of the intersection of two other social sciences - (diplomatic) history and (international) law and as a theoretical domain of political science. Due to the changes of the international environment, its object of study surpassed the boundaries of political science, history and law and embraced other sciences such as economy, anthropology, geopolitics and strategy. International relations are the set of relations that take place between states, as actors of power, in the pursuit of their interests, regardless of their political, military, economic or diplomatic nature" (Balão & Almeida e Silva, chapter 2).

REFERENCE(S)

- Balão, S. R., & Almeida e Silva, T. (2021). Diplomacy in the Context of Political Science, International Relations and Strategic Studies. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 2). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7
- Caramani, D. (Ed.) (2020). *Comparative politics* (5th ed.). Oxford.
- Sartori, G. (1973). What is Politics?. *Political Theory*, 1(1), 5-26.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

- Ribeiro, A. S. (2010). *Teoria Geral da Estratégia. O essencial ao processo estratégico* (General Theory of Strategy. Essentials of the strategic process). Coimbra: Almedina.

Power (soft, hard, smart)

Communication and Diplomacy

Power is “the ability to influence the behavior of others to get the outcomes one wants” (Nye, 2009, p. 160).

Nye differentiates between two types of power: hard and soft power. Soft power emerges as an alternative to hard power, “the ability to get others to act in ways that are contrary to their initial preferences and strategies” (Nye, 2011, p. 11). In Nye’s view (2005), the traditional forms of power that value tangible resources, such as territory, population, or economic and military capabilities, are losing importance to the emergence of new forms of power based on intangible resources, such as culture, values, knowledge and education, and transnational threats such as climate change, terrorism or epidemics. Nye (2005) recognizes that soft power alone is rarely sufficient, even though it is a multiplier for the actions performed, the ability to get “others to want the outcomes that you want”, and more particularly “the ability to achieve goals through attraction rather than coercion” (Nye, 2004, p. 5). Hard power, on the other hand, is founded on threat and coercion, tied to military and economic forces. He argues that soft power is as important as hard power, and even more so in international politics. Indeed, soft power enables a change of behaviour in others, without competition or conflict, by using persuasion and attraction. In this context, the author created the concept of smart power, which is achieved through the strategic and balanced use of soft power and hard power, enhancing them (Nye, 2004).

REFERENCE(S)

- Nye, J. (2004). *Soft Power. The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
 Nye, J. (2009). Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power. *Foreign Affairs*, 88(4), 160-163.
 Nye, J. (2011). *The Future of Power*. New York: Public Affairs.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

- Balão, S. R., & Almeida e Silva, T. (2021). Diplomacy in the Context of Political Science, International Relations and Strategic Studies. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 2). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Professionalisation

Communication and Diplomacy

Professions are organised in professional organisations with their own codes of ethics and conduct, and they hold autonomy in relation to state, also ensuring autonomy of professionals in relation to their clients (Lundgreen, 2011; Tenorth, 1977). The term professionalisation within this context indicates the process by which an occupation becomes a profession.

"To meet the sociological definition of a profession, an industry must possess the following traits: a cognitive base; training, credentials or license; work autonomy; colleague control; performance and control assessment with a punishment and reward system; code of ethics, and professional associations" (Guiora, Cotton & Sebastião, chapter 6).

REFERENCE(S)

Guiora, A., Cotton, A.-M. & Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Diplomats & Public Relations Practitioners: similar functions but distinct professional status and recognition? In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 6). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Horn, K. P. (2016). Profession, professionalisation, professionalism, professionalism—historical and systematic remarks using the example of German teacher education. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 38(2), 130-140.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Baillargeon, D., & David, M. D. (Eds.). (2013). *La professionnalisation des communicateurs: dynamiques, tensions et vecteurs* (Vol. 1). Presses universitaires de Louvain.

Brulois, V., Carignan, M. E., David, M. D., & Errecart, A. (2016). Dynamiques de professionnalisation en communication: entre ruptures et continuités, prescription et émancipation. *Revue Communication & professionnalisation*, 4, 5-22.

Catellani, A., Domenget, J. C., & Le Moing-Maas, E. (Eds.). (2017). Professionnalisation et Ethique de la communication [Special issue]. *Communication & professionnalisation*, 6. DOI: 10.14428/rcompro.v0i6

Cotton, A.-M. (2017). Qu'apporte l'identité collective des associations professionnelles à la construction de l'identité professionnelle du responsable de la communication?. *Question(s) de Management*, 1, 15-36.

Lundgreen, P. (2011). Pädagogische Professionen. Ausbildung und Professionalität in historischer Perspektive. [Pedagogical Professions. Education and Professionality in an Historical Perspective]. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 57, 9-39.

Public diplomacy



Public diplomacy

Public diplomacy seeks to win the goodwill of foreign publics on behalf of the state.

“The basic distinction between traditional diplomacy and public diplomacy is clear: the former is about relationships between the representatives of states, or other international actors; whereas the latter targets the general public in foreign societies and more specific non-official groups, organizations and individuals” (Melissen, 2005, p. 5).

Public diplomacy deals with “government-sponsored programs, mainly targeting foreign publics to shape the communication environment in which a country’s foreign policies are explained in overseas countries” (Ordeix-Rigo & Duarte, 2009, p. 550), focusing the protection of a country’s national interest abroad.

Public diplomacy relates to soft power as practices involving 'communication interventions' into foreign policy issues by actively utilizing soft power assets; often at the level of campaigns, and often conflating a range of communicative practices – such as culture, advocacy and branding – under its umbrella (Pamment, 2014, p. 52).

The emergence of public diplomacy correlates to new purposes of diplomacy but also to changes brought by technological evolution and with social change (Zaharna, 2010).

Public diplomacy

Public diplomacy

REFERENCE(S)

Melissen, J. (2005). The New Public Diplomacy: Between theory and practice. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations* (pp. 3-27). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ordeix-Rigo, E., & Duarte, J. (2009). From Public Diplomacy to Corporate Diplomacy: Increasing corporation's legitimacy and influence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(4), 549-564. DOI: 10.1177/0002764209347630

Pamment, J. (2014). Articulating influence: Toward a research agenda for interpreting the evaluation of soft power, public diplomacy and nation brands. *Public Relations Review*, 40(1), 50-59. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.11.019

Zaharna, R. S. (2010). *Battles to Bridges. U. S. strategic communication and public diplomacy after 9/11*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Cotton, A.-M. (2019). La voix de l'Union Européenne sur Twitter: de l'usage de la diplomatie publique par le Service des Affaires Etrangères (SEAS). *Revue Internationale des Sciences Commerciales*, 16(2), 51-64.

Cotton, A.-M., Sebastião, S.P. (2021). From Diplomacy to (New) Public Diplomacy: a communication perspective. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 3). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

de Carvalho Spínola, S., Boulanger, H., & Cotton, A.-M. (2016). La diplomatie "publique" ou le pouvoir de négociation des organisations internationales: le cas du Service des Affaires Etrangères de l'UE (SEAE). *Revue de Management et de Stratégie*, 2(10), 33-54.

Public diplomat



Public diplomacy

The public diplomat "needs to incorporate old and new ways: balance secrecy and transparency; listen to publics' expectations; engage with a broad net of new players, participate into networks, share and amplify advocates' voices, without losing the sense of its mission" (Cotton & Sebastião, 2021, chapter 3).

The core essence for the public diplomat relies on communication, while representation is a peripheral essence. His/her competencies are tied to international relations, communication, and political sciences. The discourses s/he develops are based on propaganda, information, and soft power to win the hearts and minds of foreign publics. S/he doesn't benefit from a high personalisation like the diplomat, but rather stands in anonymity except when s/he acts as spokesperson. The public diplomat's activities include news management; strategic communication; relationship building, in cooperation or in competition with other actors (e.g. states, organisations, interest groups). The public diplomat is responsible to plan and develop these activities. As such and due to the omnipresence of communication knowledge and skills in these dimensions, the public diplomat must be trained in communication and public relations (Guiora, Cotton & Sebastião, 2021, chapter 6).

REFERENCE(S)

Cotton, A.-M. & Sebastião, S. P. (2021). From Diplomacy to (New) Public Diplomacy: a communication perspective. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 3). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Guiora, A., Cotton, A.-M. & Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Diplomats & Public Relations Practitioners: similar functions but distinct professional status and recognition? In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 6). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Public relations

Communication and Diplomacy

“PR [public relations] is the (maintenance of) relationships (with) publics (by) communication (in order to) establish mutual understanding” (van Ruler & Verčič, 2002, p. 13).

REFERENCE(S)

van Ruler, B., & Verčič, D. (2002). *The Bled Manifesto on Public Relations*. Ljubljana: Pristop.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Bernays, E. (1952). *Public Relations*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Botan, C., & Hazleton, V. (2006). *Public Relations Theory II*. New Jersey: Routledge.

Cutlip, S., Center, A., & Broom, G. (1994). *Effective Public Relations* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall International Editions.

Grunig, J., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*. Orlando: HBJ.

Heath, R. (2001). *Handbook of Public Relations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Ihlen, Ø., van Ruler, B., & Fredriksson, M. (2009). *Public Relations and Social Theory*. London, New York: Routledge.

L'Etang, J., & Pieczka, M. (1996). *Critical Perspectives in Public Relations*. London: Thomson Business Press.

Ledingham, J., & Bruning, S. (2000). *Public Relations as Relationship Management: a relational approach to the study and practice of public relations*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sriramesh, K., & Verčič, D. (2003). *The Global Public Relations Handbook - Theory, Research and Practice*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tench, R., & Yeomans, L. (2006). *Exploring Public Relations*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Public relations professional

Communication and Diplomacy

Public relations professionals consider themselves as promoters of bidirectional communication, for the convergence of interests and the engineering of consent (Bernays, 1947, 1952). The roles of the public relations professional are counseling, research, media relations, publicity, employee/member relations, community relations, public affairs, government affairs, issues management, financial relations, industry relations, development/fund-raising, multicultural relations/workplace diversity, special events, marketing communications (Wilcox, Cameron & Reber, 2015, pp. 41-42).

REFERENCE(S)

Bernays, E. L. (1947). The Engineering of Consent. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 250, 113-120. DOI: 10.1177/000271624725000116

Bernays, E. L. (1952/1980). *Public Relations*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Wilcox, D. L., Cameron, G. T. & Reber, B. H. (2015). *Public Relations: Strategies and Tactics* (11th ed.). London: Pearson.

Science diplomacy



Public diplomacy

"Science diplomacy is the symbiosis between the interests of the scientific community and the diplomatic community. Science diplomacy as a link between two autonomous fields – science and diplomacy – and two policies – foreign policy and science policy" (Aranda, 2021, chapter 10).

Alternative expressions: "scientific diplomacy" (Varela, Costa & Godinho, 2017), "innovation diplomacy" (Junior, 2010), "science and technology diplomacy" (Japan Cabinet Office, 2018) or "science, technology and innovation diplomacy" (Gobierno de España, 2016).

REFERENCE(S)

- Aranda, J. (2021). Science Diplomacy: Knowledge is Power. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 10). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7
- Gobierno de España (2016). *Informe sobre Diplomacia Científica, Tecnológica y de Innovación* (Report on Scientific, Technological and Innovation Diplomacy). Madrid.
- Japan Cabinet Office (2008). *Toward the reinforcement of science and technology diplomacy*. Tokyo.
- Júnior, A. (2010). Relatório da sessão Diplomacia da inovação (Innovation diplomacy session report). *Parcerias Estratégicas*, 15(31), 297-308.
- Varela, C., Costa, C. M., & Godinho, M. M. (2017). Diplomacia científica: do conhecimento acadêmico ao soft power político (Scientific diplomacy: from academic knowledge to political soft power). *Janus 2017-A comunicação mundializada*, 60-61. Available at: https://janusonline.pt/images/anuario2017/1.26_Carolina%20C%C3%A1tiaManuel_Diplomacia Cientifica.pdf

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

- Burns, W. (2013). The potential of science diasporas. *Science & Diplomacy*, 2(4). Available at: <https://www.sciencediplomacy.org/perspective/2013/potential-science-diasporas>
- Flink, T. & Schreiterer, U. (2010). Science diplomacy at the intersection of S&T policies and foreign affairs: Toward a typology of national approaches. *Science and Public Policy*, 37(9), 665-677. DOI: 10.3152/030234210X12778118264530
- The Royal Society (2010). *New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy: Navigating the Changing Balance of Power*. London: The Royal Society.
- Turekian, V. & Neureiter, N. (2012). Science and Diplomacy: The Past as Prologue. *Science & Diplomacy*, 1(1). Available at: <https://www.sciencediplomacy.org/editorial/2012/science-and-diplomacy>

Social movements


 Civil society diplomacy

“Social movements are not new in human history. Citizens’ common interest or shared beliefs (Melucci, 1996) about their national government or about the international attention regarding a shared cause are responsible for both unplanned and intentional changes and for alteration of social function and political structures. Each of these social movements is characterized by a unique identity and an explicit goal expressed by a large number of people (Tilly & Wood, 2015). Indeed, as Tilly’s (2006) guidelines for social movement success indicate, an identified cause expressed into social media platforms through the help of a large number of citizens who are highly committed to support this campaign through a high level of effort and resources willing to be sacrificed are some of the key elements to elaborate a successful social movement. [...] Modern civic national movements are composed of many individual citizens, some of them aiming at acting as influencers among and between groups through social media activities. Therefore, offline and digital activities are often intertwined and might foster reactions at international level. However, contrary to traditional movements, which have a brokered organization, these recent movements are not specifically coordinated by associations, political opponents, or non-governmental organizations” (Cmeciu & Asdourian, 2021, chapter 14).

REFERENCE(S)

- Cmeciu, C., Asdourian, B. (2021). The internationalisation of civic national movements. In: Sebastião, S. & Carvalho, S. (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations and Citizens. A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 14). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7
- Melucci, A. (1996). *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C., & Wood, L. J. (2015). *Social Movements 1768–2012*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Tilly, C. (2006) WUNC. In J. T. Schnapp & M. Tiewes, *Crowds* (pp. 289–306). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Strategic communication

Communication and Diplomacy

Strategic communication is the intentional process of co-creation of meanings and senses used by an organisation to fulfill its mission and achieve its objectives, respecting its identity and its values, based on a vision embodied in an action plan, defined by the leader and by the communication professional. Therefore, it requires the empowerment and institutionalisation of communication (Sebastião, 2021). According to Zerfass, et al. (2018) and based on a systematic review of literature, there are four main conceptions of strategic communication: 1) as an alternative designation of “public relations”; 2) as a new label for “marketing communication”, that is, for goal-oriented communication aimed at all types of publics and stakeholders, particularly used by companies (business communication); 3) as a new communicational function shifting the focus from tactical-operational support (from integrated communication) to a focus on decision-making within all types of organisations; and 4) as the designation of communications developed in the military and national power context, therefore, an element of soft power in the political-military and diplomatic spheres.

In military and governmental terms, strategic communication is defined by Paul (2011, p. 3) as the coordination of what is done and said to fulfill objectives (e.g.: the coordination of actions, messages, images and other forms of signaling or engagement aimed at informing, influencing or persuading selected audiences to support national goals). For the author, the actions of informing, influencing and persuading are important. Therefore, to be effective in communication terms, clear objectives are needed, which guide, in an integrated, credible and coherent manner, the coordination and implementation of communication actions. Communication, information and influence therefore include public affairs, psyops (psychological operations), public diplomacy and civic affairs (Paul, 2011, p. 31), to create and maintain credibility, promote shared values and improve the national image.

REFERENCE(S)

Sebastião, S. P. (2021). *Comunicação Estratégica na Relação com os Media* (Strategic Communication and Media Relations). Lisbon: ISCSP.

Paul, C. (2011). *Strategic Communication. Origins, concepts, and current debates*. Praeger.

Zerfass, A., Verčič, D., Nothhaft, H. & Werder, K. P. (2018). Strategic Communication: Defining the field and its contribution to research and practice. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 12(4), 487-505. DOI: 10.1080/1553118X.2018.1493485

Strategy

Communication and Diplomacy

Strategy is related to power and decision making and, when associated with communication, it is assumed as a managerial intention that allows the creation of value. The strategy is part of a process that must be managed efficiently to create value for the parties involved (organisation and publics). Therefore, considering the understanding of the strategy in the sense of the logical direction (rationale) chosen by the organisation to achieve its mission, it is necessary to align what is said and what is done. In other words, the communication strategy is the general approach and reflects a certain communication objective taking into account human, material and financial resources.

Mintzberg (1991) defines the framework for the strategy systematising it in 5 P:

1. Strategy as a Plan that defines organisational action, with pre-defined, linear and formal rules, with an analytical and somewhat deterministic component;
2. Strategy as a Pattern that gives consistency to behaviours, allowing for the organisation's constructive learning and evolution;
3. Strategy as Positioning that allows the organisation to adjust internally and externally, distinguishing it from its surroundings;
4. Strategy as Perspective, as the organisation's vision of the market.
5. Strategy as Ploy pre-determined or emergent action defined to antagonise a competitor, survive and sustain itself.

Strategy

Communication and Diplomacy

The definition of the communication strategy involves a set of decisions about identity, values and publics. 'Strategic decisions' are distinguished from 'operational decisions' in terms of the dimensions of time, frequency, necessary effort, consequences and impact. Strategic decisions (Fleisher & Bensoussan, 2015):

1. Apply in the medium, long term (time);
2. Are sporadic or emerge in planning cycles (frequency);
3. Require significant input from experts (effort);
4. Require substantial resources to be formulated and implemented (effort);
5. Affect the organisation in its long-term vision (consequences);
6. Affect several – sometimes all – areas of the organisation's activity (consequences);
7. Affect competitive dynamics (impact);
8. Involve changes in the organisation's activity (impact);
9. Become a reference for the organisation's subsequent decisions (impact).

REFERENCE(S)

Fleisher, C. S., & Bensoussan, B. E. (2015). *Strategic and competitive intelligence analysis. Effective application of new and classic methods* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.

Mintzberg, H. (1991). Five P's for strategy. In H. Mintzberg, & J. B. Quinn (Eds.), *The strategy process: concepts, contexts, cases* (2nd ed., pp. 12-19). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Hamel, G. & Prahalad, C. K. (2003). Strategic intent. In H. Mintzberg, J. Lampel, J. B. Quinn, & S. Ghoshal (Eds.), *The strategy process. Concepts, contexts, cases* (4th International ed., pp. 88-91). New Jersey: Pearson Education International.

Transparency

Communication and Diplomacy

Transparency is one of the main ethical principles and one of the most challenging. It can be defined as the possibility to access, scrutinise and understand information. Transparency is an ethical value anchored in the authenticity of discourses, in the construction and attribution of meanings arising from the communication flows that allow establishing and maintaining relationships between organisations and publics. Communicative transparency is ethically motivated, mutually constitutive, authentic and aims to increase understanding, trust, and accountability of social actors involved in communication processes, being negotiated in the interests of society (Vujnovic & Kruckeberg, 2016, p. 131).

In diplomatic settings "neither secrecy nor transparency can exclude the other term from the negotiator's strategy: as much as secrecy vis-à-vis third parties promotes the efficiency of the negotiation process, transparency reinforces the legitimacy of the negotiated result and vice versa" (Lequesne, 2012, p.11). To be credible with public opinions, diplomats must therefore learn to no longer define messages to targeted publics on their own.

REFERENCE(S)

Cotton, A.-M. & Sebastião, S.P. (2021). From Diplomacy to (New) Public Diplomacy: a communication perspective. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 3). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Lequesne, C. (2012). La diplomatie publique: un objet nouveau? *Mondes*, 11, 9-12.

Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Becoming an Ethical ambassador: proposal for a PR & PD Practitioner Course on Ethics. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 15). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Vujnovic, M. & Kruckeberg, D. (2016). Pitfalls and promises of transparency in the digital age. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 5(2), 121-143.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Wehmeier, S., & Raaz, O. (2012). Transparency matters: the concept of organizational transparency in the academic discourse. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 1(3), 337-366.

Trust

Communication and Diplomacy

Trust is "an inalienable principle in the processes of negotiation and contact between the actors involved in the diplomatic process" (Cotton & Sebastião, 2021, chapter 3).

Trust is "the state of a person, group or institution vis-à-vis an object, mechanism, animal, physical environment, group or institution; this state is based on affective, intuitive or a set of information [intelligence]; it allows to anticipate a reaction or behaviour in a particular situation" (Servet, 1994, p. 39). According to Hosmer (1995), this anticipation is based on the underlying assumption of an implicit moral duty. Hence trust becomes "the anticipation carried out by a person, a group or a company of ethically justifiable behaviour - that is to say, decisions and actions that are morally correct and based on the principles of ethical analyses - of the part of the other person, group or company as part of a joint effort or an economic exchange" (Hosmer, 1995, p. 381). It is relying on this principle, that the future of our project foresees the need for a course for diplomats and public relations practitioners (Sebastião, 2021, chapter 15).

REFERENCE(S)

Cotton, A.-M. & Sebastião, S. P. (2021). From Diplomacy to (New) Public Diplomacy: a communication perspective. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 3). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Hosmer, L. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 379-403.

Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Becoming an Ethical ambassador: proposal for a PR & PD Practitioner Course on Ethics. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 15). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Servet, J. M. (1994). La confiance, un facteur décisif de la mobilisation de l'épargne. *Notes de recherches*, 94(41). Paris: AUPELF-UREF.

RECOMMENDED REFERENCE(S)

Cotton, A.-M., Carvalho, S. (2017). Le discours éducationnel dialogique et la confiance: entre conditions a priori et a posteriori. Etude de cas: Programme Intensif Erasmus «Relations publiques: relations gouvernementales et lobbying dans une perspective européenne». *Epistémé*, 17, 107-134.

Luhmann N. (1979). *Trust and Power*. Chichester: Wiley.

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Adesina, O. S. (2017). Foreign policy in an era of digital diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1). DOI: 10.1080/23311886.2017.1297175

Digital diplomacy, Diplomacy

Anton, A. (2021). Conceptual Pathways to Civil Society Diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 5). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Citizen diplomacy, Civic diplomacy, Civil society diplomacy, Non-state actors, Non-state civil society diplomacy agents

Anton, A. & Lăcătuș, M. (2021). Digital Diplomacy. The Case of the Embassy of Sweden in Bucharest. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 12). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Dialogic communication, Non-state actors

Anton, A. & Moise, R. (2021). The Citizen Diplomats and their Pathway to Diplomatic Power. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 13). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Citizen diplomat

Aranda, J. (2021). Science Diplomacy: Knowledge is Power. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 10). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Science diplomacy

Baillargeon, D., & David, M. D. (Eds.). (2013). *La professionnalisation des communicateurs: dynamiques, tensions et vecteurs* (Vol. 1). Presses universitaires de Louvain.

Professionalisation

Balão, S. R., & Almeida e Silva, T. (2021). Diplomacy in the Context of Political Science, International Relations and Strategic Studies. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 2). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Diplomacy, Foreign policy, Political science and International relations, Power (soft, hard, smart)

Barston, R. (2014). *Modern diplomacy* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Digital diplomacy

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Bernays, E. L. (1947). The Engineering of Consent. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 250, 113-120. DOI: 10.1177/000271624725000116

Public relations professional

Bernays, E. L. (1952/1980). *Public Relations*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Public relations, Public relations professional

Bjola, C. (2015). Introduction: Making sense of digital diplomacy. In C. Bjola & M. Holmes (Eds.), *Digital diplomacy: Theory and practice* (pp. 1-9). New York: Routledge.

Digital diplomacy

Bolewski, W. (2007). Citizen diplomats and public relations diplomacy: popularization of diplomacy. In W. Bolewski, *Diplomacy and International Law in Globalized Relations* (pp. 69-72). Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer.

Citizen diplomat

Bolewski, W. (2019). Diplomatic engagement with transnational corporations: a path to sustainable governance. *International Journal of Diplomacy and Economy*, 5(1), 42-52. DOI: 10.1504/IJDIPE.2019.099140.

Corporate diplomacy

Botan, C., & Hazleton, V. (2006). *Public Relations Theory II*. New Jersey: Routledge.

Public relations

Brulois, V., Carignan, M. E., David, M. D., & Errecart, A. (2016). Dynamiques de professionnalisation en communication: entre ruptures et continuités, prescription et émancipation. *Revue Communication & professionnalisation*, 4, 5-22.

Professionalisation

Burns, W. (2013). The potential of science diasporas. *Science & Diplomacy*, 2(4). Available at: <https://www.sciencediplomacy.org/perspective/2013/potential-science-diasporas>

Science diplomacy

Caramani, D. (Ed.) (2020). *Comparative politics* (5th ed.). Oxford.

Political science and International relations

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Catellani, A., Domenget, J. C., & Le Moing-Maas, E. (Eds.). (2017). Professionnalisation et Ethique de la communication [Special issue]. *Communication & professionnalisation*, 6. DOI: 10.14428/rcompro.v0i6

Professionalisation

Cmeciu, C., Asdourian, B. (2021). The internationalisation of civic national movements. In: Sebastião, S. & Carvalho, S. (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations and Citizens. A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 14). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Social movements

Cohen, R. (1998). *Putting diplomatic studies on the map. Diplomatic studies program newsletter*. Leicester: Centre for the Study of Diplomacy.

Diplomacy

Cotton, A.-M. (2017). Qu'apporte l'identité collective des associations professionnelles à la construction de l'identité professionnelle du responsable de la communication?. *Question(s) de Management*, 1, 15-36.

Professionalisation

Cotton, A.-M. (2019). Educational Discourse and Digital Media: toward co-regulated learning? *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis*, 55(2), 115-144.

Co-creation

Cotton, A.-M. (2019). La voix de l'Union Européenne sur Twitter: de l'usage de la diplomatie publique par le Service des Affaires Etrangères (SEAS). *Revue Internationale des Sciences Commerciales*, 16(2), 51-64.

Public diplomacy

Cotton, A.-M., Carvalho, S. (2017). Le discours éducationnel dialogique et la confiance: entre conditions a priori et a posteriori. Etude de cas: Programme Intensif Erasmus «Relations publiques: relations gouvernementales et lobbying dans une perspective européenne». *Epistémé*, 17, 107-134.

Trust

Cotton, A.-M., Sebastião, S.P. (2021). From Diplomacy to (New) Public Diplomacy: a communication perspective. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 3). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Public diplomacy, Public diplomat, Transparency, Trust

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Cutlip, S., Center, A., & Broom, G. (1994). *Effective Public Relations* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall International Editions.

Public diplomacy

de Carvalho Spínola, S., Boulanger, H., & Cotton, A.-M. (2016). La diplomatie “publique” ou le pouvoir de négociation des organisations internationales: le cas du Service des Affaires Etrangères de l'UE (SEAE). *Revue de Management et de Stratégie*, 2(10), 33-54.

Public diplomacy

de Carvalho Spínola, S. & Cotton, A.-M. (2021). From corporate to organisational diplomacy. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 4). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Corporate diplomacy, Non-state actors, Organisational diplomacy

Fleisher, C. S., & Bensoussan, B. E. (2015). *Strategic and competitive intelligence analysis. Effective application of new and classic methods* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.

Strategy

Flink, T. & Schreiterer, U. (2010). Science diplomacy at the intersection of S&T policies and foreign affairs: Toward a typology of national approaches. *Science and Public Policy*, 37(9), 665-677. DOI: 10.3152/030234210X12778118264530

Science diplomacy

Gobierno de España (2016). *Informe sobre Diplomacia Científica, Tecnológica y de Innovación* (Report on Scientific, Technological and Innovation Diplomacy). Madrid.

Science diplomacy

Grunig, J., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*. Orlando: HBJ.

Public relations

Grunig, J. E. (2009). Paradigms of global public relations in an age of digitalisation. *PRism*, 6(2), 1-19.

Dialogic communication

Guiora, A., Cotton, A.-M., Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Public Diplomats & Public Relations Practitioners: similar functions but distinct professional status and recognition? In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 6). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Diplomacy, Diplomat, Professionalisation, Public diplomat

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Haas, P.M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Politics Coordination. *International Organization*, 46(1), 1-35. DOI: 10.1017/S0020818300001442

Epistemic community

Hallams, E. (2010). Digital diplomacy: The internet, the battle for ideas & US foreign policy. *CEU Political Science Journal*, 4, 538-574.

Digital diplomacy

Hamel, G. & Prahalad, C. K. (2003). Strategic intent. In H. Mintzberg, J. Lampel, J. B. Quinn, & S. Ghoshal (Eds.), *The strategy process. Concepts, contexts, cases* (4th International ed., pp. 88-91). New Jersey: Pearson Education International.

Strategy

Harris, B. (2013). Diplomacy 2.0: The future of social media in nation branding. *The Journal of Public Diplomacy*, 4, Art. 3.

Digital diplomacy

Heath, R. (2001). *Handbook of Public Relations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Public relations

Horn, K. P. (2016). Profession, professionalisation, professionalism, professionalism—historical and systematic remarks using the example of German teacher education. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 38(2), 130-140.

Professionalisation

Hosmer, L. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 379-403.

Trust

Ihlen, Ø., van Ruler, B., & Fredriksson, M. (2009). *Public Relations and Social Theory*. London, New York: Routledge.

Public relations

Ittefaq, M. (2019). Digital Diplomacy via Social Networks: A Cross-National Analysis of Governmental Usage of Facebook and Twitter for Digital Engagement. *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, 18(1), 49-69. DOI: 10.17477/jcea.2019.18.1.049

Dialogic communication

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Japan Cabinet Office (2008). *Toward the reinforcement of science and technology diplomacy*. Tokyo.

Science diplomacy

Josselin, D., Wallace, W. (2001). Non-state Actors in World Politics: a Framework. In D. Josselin, W. Wallace (Eds.), *Non-state Actors in World Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9781403900906_1

Non-state actors

Júnior, A. (2010). Relatório da sessão Diplomacia da inovação (Innovation diplomacy session report). *Parcerias Estratégicas*, 15(31), 297-308.

Science diplomacy

Kalu, K. N. (2017). *Citizenship: Identity, Institutions, and the Postmodern Challenge*. New York: Routledge.

Citizenship

Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the world wide web. *Public Relations Review*, 24(3), 321-334. DOI: 10.1016/S0363-8111(99)80143-X

Dialogic communication

Langhorne, R. (2005). The Diplomacy of Non-State Actors. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 16(2), 331-339. DOI: 10.1080/09592290590948388

Non-state actors

Ledingham, J., & Bruning, S. (2000). *Public Relations as Relationship Management: a relational approach to the study and practice of public relations*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Public relations

Lequesne, C. (2012). La diplomatie publique: un objet nouveau? *Mondes*, 11, 9-12.

Transparency

L'Etang, J., & Pieczka, M. (1996). *Critical Perspectives in Public Relations*. London: Thomson Business Press.

Public relations

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

L'Etang, J. (2006). Public relations as diplomacy. In J. L'Etang & M. Pieczka (Eds.), *Public Relations. Critical debates and contemporary practice* (pp. 373-388). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Diplomacy

Luhmann N. (1979). *Trust and Power*. Chichester: Wiley.

Trust

Lundgreen, P. (2011). Pädagogische Professionen. Ausbildung und Professionalität in historischer Perspektive. [Pedagogical Professions. Education and Professionalism in an Historical Perspective]. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 57, 9-39.

Professionalisation

Magalhães, J. (1982). *Diplomacia Pura* [Pure Diplomacy]. Associação Portuguesa para o Estudo das Relações Internacionais. Lisboa: Bertrand Editora.

Diplomacy, Foreign policy

Manor, I. (2019). *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy*. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-04405-3

Digital diplomacy, Dialogic communication

Melissen, J. (2005). The New Public Diplomacy: Between theory and practice. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations* (pp. 3-27). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Public diplomacy

Melucci, A. (1996). *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Social movements

Meyer, M. & Molyneux-Hodgson, S. (2010). Introduction: The Dynamics of Epistemic Communities. *Sociological Research Online*, 15(2), 109-115. DOI: 10.5153/sro.2154

Epistemic community

Mintzberg, H. (1991). Five P's for strategy. In H. Mintzberg, & J. B. Quinn (Eds.), *The strategy process: concepts, contexts, cases* (2nd ed., pp. 12-19). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Strategy

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Mogensen, K. (2017). From public relations to corporate public diplomacy. *Public Relations Review*, 43(3), 605-614. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.03.011

Business diplomacy

Mogensen, K. (2020). Dialogue and business legitimacy. In J. D. Rendtorff, *Handbook of business legitimacy. Responsibility, Ethics and Society* (pp. 556-570). Springer.

Corporate diplomacy

Mueller, S. (2009). The Nexus of U.S. Public Diplomacy and Citizen Diplomacy. In N. Snow, & P. M. Taylor (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy* (pp. 101-107). New York: Routledge.

Citizen diplomacy

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft Power. The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

Power (soft, hard, smart)

Nye, J. (2009). Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power. *Foreign Affairs*, 88(4), 160-163.

Power (soft, hard, smart)

Nye, J. (2011). *The Future of Power*. New York: Public Affairs.

Power (soft, hard, smart)

Okano-Heijmans, M., & Asano, T. (2018). Economic diplomacy. In M. McCarthy, *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Foreign Policy* (pp. 251-266). London: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315643076

Economic diplomacy

Ordeix-Rigo, E., & Duarte, J. (2009). From public diplomacy to corporate diplomacy: increasing corporation's legitimacy and influence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(4), 549-564. DOI: 10.1177/0002764209347630.

Corporate diplomacy, Public diplomacy

Pamment, J. (2014). Articulating influence: Toward a research agenda for interpreting the evaluation of soft power, public diplomacy and nation brands. *Public Relations Review*, 40(1), 50-59. DOI: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.11.019

Public diplomacy

Paul, C. (2011). *Strategic Communication. Origins, concepts, and current debates*. Praeger.

Strategic communication

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Pigman, G. A. (2010). *Contemporary Diplomacy. Representation and Communication in a Globalized World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Diplomacy

Ramaswamy, V., & Ozcan, K. (2018). What is co-creation? An interactional creation framework and its implications for value creation. *Journal of Business Research*, 84, 196-205.

Co-creation

Ribeiro, A. S. (2010). *Teoria Geral da Estratégia. O essencial ao processo estratégico* (General Theory of Strategy. Essentials of the strategic process). Coimbra: Almedina.

Political science and International relations

Riordan, S. (2019). *Cyberdiplomacy. Managing security and governance online*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Diplomat

Ruël, H. J. (2015). *Business diplomacy: a definition and operationalization*. Windesheim University of Applied Sciences.

Business diplomacy

Ruël, H. J., & Wolters, T. (2016). Business Diplomacy. In C. M. Constantinou, P. Kerr, & P. Sharp, *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Corporate diplomacy

Sandre, A. (2012). *Twiplomacy is bringing diplomacy back to relevancy*. Retrieved from <http://www.diplomacy.edu/blog/twiplomacy-bringing-diplomacy-back-relevancy>

Digital diplomacy

Saner, R., Yiu, L., & Sondergaard, M. (2000). Business Diplomacy Management: A Core Competency for Global Companies. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 80-92.

Corporate diplomacy

Saner, R., & Yiu, L. (2005). Swiss Executives as Business Diplomats in the New Europe: Evidence from Swiss Pharmaceutical and Agro-Industrial Global Companies. *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(3), 298-312.

Business diplomacy

Sartori, G. (1973). What is Politics?. *Political Theory*, 1(1), 5-26.

Political science and International relations

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Sebastião, S. P. (2015). Digitania© or the disillusion with a digital citizenship. *Comunicação Pública* [Online], 10(18). DOI: 10.4000/cp.988

Citizenship

Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Becoming an Ethical ambassador: proposal for a PR & PD Practitioner Course on Ethics. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (chapter 15). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Ethics, Transparency, Trust

Sebastião, S. P. (2021). *Comunicação Estratégica na Relação com os Media* (Strategic Communication and Media Relations). Lisbon: ISCSP.

Strategic communication

Sebastião, S. P. (2021). Introduction: the rationale for a communication perspective. In S. P. Sebastião & S. C. Spínola (Eds.), *Diplomacy, Organisations & Citizens: A European Communication Perspective* (Introduction). Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7

Communication

Servet, J. M. (1994). La confiance, un facteur décisif de la mobilisation de l'épargne. *Notes de recherches*, 94(41). Paris: AUPELF-UREF.

Trust

Sharp, P. (2001). Making Sense of Citizen Diplomats: The People of Duluth, Minnesota, as International Actors. *International Studies Perspectives*, 2(2), 131-150.

Citizen diplomat

Steger, U. (2003). *Corporate diplomacy. The strategy for a volatile, fragmented business environment*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Corporate diplomacy

Sriramesh, K., & Verčič, D. (2003). *The Global Public Relations Handbook - Theory, Research and Practice*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Public relations

Stanzel, V. (Ed.). (2018). *New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century*. German Institute for International and Security Affairs. Retrieved from https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/research_papers/2018RP11_sze.pdf

Citizen diplomat

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571-610.

Legitimacy

Tench, R., & Yeomans, L. (2006). *Exploring Public Relations*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Public relations

The Center for Citizen Diplomacy. *Understanding Citizen Diplomacy*. Available at <https://www.centerforcitizendiplomacy.org/about-us/understanding/>

Citizen diplomacy

The Royal Society (2010). *New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy: Navigating the Changing Balance of Power*. London: The Royal Society.

Science diplomacy

Tilly, C. (2006) WUNC. In J. T. Schnapp & M. Tiews, *Crowds* (pp. 289-306). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Social movements

Tilly, C., & Wood, L. J. (2015). *Social Movements 1768-2012*. New York and London: Routledge.

Social movements

Turekian, V. & Neureiter, N. (2012). Science and Diplomacy: The Past as Prologue. *Science & Diplomacy*, 1(1). Available at: <https://www.sciencediplomacy.org/editorial/2012/science-and-diplomacy>

Science diplomacy

United Nations (2005). *Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. United Nations 1961*. Treaty Series, vol. 500, p. 95. Available at

https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/9_1_1961.pdf

Diplomat

van Ruler, B., & Verčič, D. (2002). *The Bled Manifesto on Public Relations*. Ljubljana: Pristop.

Public relations

Varela, C., Costa, C. M., & Godinho, M. M. (2017). Diplomacia científica: do conhecimento acadêmico ao soft power político (Scientific diplomacy: from academic knowledge to political soft power). *Janus 2017-A comunicação mundializada*, 60-61.

Science diplomacy

Reference list

Communication and Diplomacy

Public diplomacy

Organisational diplomacy

Civil society diplomacy

Vujnovic, M. & Kruckeberg, D. (2016). Pitfalls and promises of transparency in the digital age. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 5(2), 121-143.

Transparency

Wehmeier, S., & Raaz, O. (2012). Transparency matters: the concept of organizational transparency in the academic discourse. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 1(3), 337-366.

Transparency

Wehrenfennig, D. (2012). From an analog past to a digital future: Information and communication technology. In S. S. Costigan & J. Perry (Eds.), *Cyberspaces and global affairs* (chapter 23). London: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315575711

Digital diplomacy

Wilcox, D. L., Cameron, G. T. & Reber, B. H. (2015). *Public Relations: Strategies and Tactics* (11th ed.). London: Pearson.

Public relations professional

Yi, K., & Hayes, P. (2015). The Implications of Civic Diplomacy for ROK Foreign Policy. In P. Hayes, & K. Yi (Eds.), *Complexity, Security and Civil Society in East Asia. Foreign Policies and the Korean Peninsula* (pp. 319-392). Cambridge: Open Book Publishers. DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0059

Civic diplomacy

Zaharna, R. S. (2010). *Battles to Bridges. U. S. strategic communication and public diplomacy after 9/11*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Public diplomacy

Zerfass, A., Verčič, D., Nothhaft, H. & Werder, K. P. (2018). Strategic Communication: Defining the field and its contribution to research and practice. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 12(4), 487-505. DOI: 10.1080/1553118X.2018.1493485

Strategic communication

Disclaimer

To whom it may concern, this is an original glossary of the MARPE Diplo team, developed within the Erasmus+ MARPE Diplo project.

You are free to use it for pedagogical purposes. If you do so, please let us know about it. In the Erasmus+ spirit of collaboration and openness, we would like to share with you our experiences and recommendations, as well as hear from you about the results, strengths and weaknesses, or suggestions for improvement.

In case of implementation by a third party, the MARPE Diplo team has no responsibility for eventual bad results or lack of satisfaction from participants.

The MARPE Diplo team gives no guarantee of success because training and pedagogical approaches are about the content (guidelines you can find in this document) and the personal competencies of the trainers. It is also important to create the appropriate scenario and environment, people-centred and collectively-driven, something that we succeeded in achieving within the MARPE Diplo team and project, but cannot guarantee outside it.

The MARPE Diplo Glossary can be used together with other MARPE Diplo outputs that can be found on the MARPE website:

<http://marpenetwork.eu/marpe-diplo-results/>

- MARPE Diplo Book
- MARPE Diplo Curriculum - Short Lifelong Learning Programme Proposal
- MARPE Diplo Master Curriculum
- MARPE Diplo Literature Review
- MARPE Diplo conceptual videos

Contact

NATIONAL MARPE NETWORK REPRESENTATIVES

Hélène BOULANGER - helene.boulanger@univ-lorraine.fr

Université de Lorraine, France

MARPE Diplo project coordinator | MARPE network national representative in France

Anne-Marie COTTON - am.cotton@arteveldehs.be

Artevelde University of Applied Sciences, Belgium

MARPE network coordinator | MARPE network national representative in Belgium

Susana de CARVALHO - sspinola@iscsp.ulisboa.pt

ISCSP, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

MARPE network national representative in Portugal

José MARTÍNEZ SÁEZ - pemartinez@uchceu.es

Universidad Cardenal Herrera - CEU, Spain

MARPE network national representative in Spain

Anca ANTON - anca.anton@fjsc.ro

University of Bucharest, Romania

MARPE network national representative in Romania

ONLINE AND SOCIAL MEDIA

contact@marpenetwork.eu

<http://marpenetwork.eu/>

<https://www.facebook.com/MARPENetwork/>

<https://twitter.com/mastermarpe>

<https://www.instagram.com/marpenetwork/>

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCCeDHk1m2-vRtlot0S2xiWQ>